## New International – Fourth International (SWP, USA)
***Articles by Canadian authors***

***New International***
***(*Socialist Workers Party – Cannon-Dobbs-Warde-Hansen – 1930s-*1970s)***

| | |
|---|---|
| 1938-00 | *Cover*: *The New International* (SWP-USA, "organ of revolutionary Marxism") |
| 1938-01Jan-1a | Books: "After Twenty Years" (Soviet Russia): Reviews by Maurice Spector |
| 1938-01Jan-1b | p.29: "...reading and economic data from Soviet sources..." |
| 1938-01Jan-1c | p.30: (bottom box) "The Challenge of Youth" subscriptions |
| 1938-04Apr-1a | "The Record of the Democracies " |
| 1938-04Apr-1b | p.116:Sections 2 and 3. (Versailles Peace Conference) |
| 1938-04Apr-1c | p.117:Sections 4, 5, 6: (Strangling the Russian Revolution, the Great Depression) |
| 1938-04Apr-1d | p.118:Section 7: (The "crisis of democracy") |
| 1938-04Apr-1e | p.119: Signed: Maurice Spector |
| 1938-06June-1a | "The Collapse of the New Deal" "The 'Roosevelt Revolution" |
| 1938-06June-1b | p.174: "Recovery – Diminuendo" "The Social Crisis" |
| 1938-06June-1c | p.175: "The masses themselves..." Signed Maurice Spector |
| 1938-07July-1a | "John Bull's Other Hell": (book review of "Famine"- on British imperialism) |
| 1938-07July-1b | p.223: Signed: E. Robertson (Earl Birney) |
| 1938-08Aug-1 | Books ("The English Worker" – a review of "Seven Shifts" by E. Robertson (Birney) |
| 1938-09Sept-1a | "Canada and World Politics" – Land of monopolies, Canadian "Imperialism" |
| 1938-09Sept-1b | p.262: "Arrested development of an infant prodigy ... Canadian Politics" |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1938-09Sept-1c | p.263: “Canada and Martial Self-Determination” |
| 1938-09Sept-1d | p.264: “Arsenal for the Coming Slaughter” E. Robertson (Birney) |
| 1938-10Oct-1a | “The Soviets and Democracy” |
| 1938-10Oct-1b | p.302: “...the absence of Workers Democracy, economic planning...” |
| 1938-10Oct-1c | p.303: Signed Maurice Spector |
| 1938-10Oct-2a | “Is French Canada Going Fascist?” “Arcand, Fascist Chameleon |
| 1938-10Oct-2b | p.305: “Petrified Church-State” The Revolt Against Catholicism” |
| 1938-10Oct-2c | p.306: “The Padlock Law” “How Not to Fight Fascism” |
| 1938-10Oct-2d | p.307: “The Proletarian Road” Signed E. Robertson |
| 1938-11Nov-1a | “The Popular Front's Guilt” (the rise of fascism) |
| 1938-11Nov-1b | p.330: Signed Maurice Spector |

***Fourth International*** **(SWP)**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1943-08Aug-1 | Cover: *Fourth International* (SWP-USA), August 1943 |
| **1943-August* | *p.254-255: Cuba – Split in Cuban Stalinists SEE W19-1960* |
| 1943-09Sept-1a | p.261: Canadian Labor's Election Victories; Voted against the capitalist class |
| 1943-09Sept-1b | p.262: *Sidebar*: The workers distrust the capitalist future (voted CCF) |
| 1944-04Apr-1 | p.102: Developments in Canada (the CCF) and USA |
| **1944-July* | *pp.205-6-7-8: Cuba's elections (Trotskyist Movement in Cuba)* |
| 1945-03Mar-1 | Canadian Anti-War Struggles; Opposition (of the masses) in Canada |
| **1945-April* | *International Notes: Cuba – Congress of the CTC* |
| 1945-11Nov-1 | Canada (*Labour Challenge* launched; on the CCF, and the Canadian Stalinists) |

Please Return to
D. Noakes. Magna Ba

# THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

A MONTHLY ORGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM


Twenty Years of the Russian Revolution — By Max Shachtman

The Left Wing Convention and The Founding of the New Party

The Communist Manifesto 90 Years After — By Leon Trotsky

The Question of Unity in the C.I.O. and A.F. of L. — By B. J. Widick

The Anarchists in the Spanish Civil War — By Felix Morrow

The Stalinist Liquidation of Soviet China — By Li Fu-jen

John Brown, A Revolutionary Terrorist — By George Novack

Books on the Twentieth Anniversary
Feuchtwanger, Lyons, Serge, Beal, Yvon, Gide — By Maurice Spector



JANUARY 1938
TWENTY CENTS

Ours was that of Petersburg, that is, that Petersburg would carry off the affair in that manner; but Lenin departed from the point of view of a general uprising in the entire country and did not accord such a big place to the uprising of the Petersburg garrison.

The date of the uprising was fixed for October 15.

PODVOISKY: As I recall, I believe the session was held earlier, otherwise there would have been a delay.

TROTSKY: The meeting of the responsible militants undoubtedly took place after the meeting of the Central Committee, when the question was already resolved. It was then that Zinoviev and Kamenev were authorized to defend their points of view. But the decision of the Central Committee was made. From that, I conclude that the meeting of the Central Committee took place at the beginning of October, the 3rd, I think, for I recall that the uprising was foreseen for the 15th at the latest. A nuance appeared precisely over the fixing of the date. I insisted that the Revolutionary War Committee be charged with preparing the moment of the uprising for the day of the Soviet Congress, This did not arouse a big discussion, but it was decided that the uprising would take place either at the end of October or the beginning of November.

KOZMIN: Was this decision made before or after the departure of the Bolsheviks from the Pre-Parliament?

TROTSKY: It was after. When did that departure occur?

PODVOISKY: In September.

TROTSKY: I said that it was after the Bolsheviks had left the Pre-Parliament. But I cannot say exactly. In any case, this decision was made after the session of the fraction where the question was being discussed: should we enter the Pre-Parliament or not? I was a supporter of the boycott. Rykov did not share my standpoint. Only later did we receive a letter from Lenin in Finland, in which he pronounced himself for the boycott. After that, the session of the Central Committee presented the character of an effort towards getting down to exact details, dotting the *i*'s. In the behavior of the party nuclei, in the regiments, among the commissars, we felt a good deal of indecision. . . .

## An American Purge

The private lives of Stalinist functionaries are now to be investigated in preparation for a purge in the Communist Party, according to Earl Browder, writing in the *Daily Worker* (Dec. 3, 1937).

WE MUST begin to examine the private lives of all of our leading cadres as a necessary and unavoidable part of the guarantee of the political integrity of our Party. And this applies to everybody, from top to bottom. And to the degree that we find problems that cannot be corrected, let us know in advance that there is always a final way of guaranteeing the Party against dangers—that is, removing people from responsible positions . . .

# BOOKS

## After Twenty Years

MOSCOW, 1937. By LION FEUCHTWANGER. Trans. from the German by Irene Josephy. xiii+151 pp. New York. The Viking Press. $2.00.

RETURN FROM THE U.S.S.R. By ANDRÉ GIDE. Trans. from the French by Dorothy Bussy. xvi+94 pp. New York. Alfred A. Knopf. $1.00.

RETOUCHES A MON RETOUR DE L'U.R.S.S. Par ANDRE GIDÉ. 126 pp. Paris. Gallimard. Fr. 9.

WHAT HAS BECOME OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION. By M. YVON. Trans. from the French by Integer. 64 pp. New York. International Review. 25c.

PROLETARIAN JOURNEY. By FRED BEAL. xiv+352 pp. *Illus.* New York. Hillman-Curl, Inc. $2.75.

ASSIGNMENT IN UTOPIA. By EUGENE LYONS. 648 pp. New York. Harcourt, Brace and Co. $3.50.

RUSSIA: TWENTY YEARS AFTER. By VICTOR SERGE. Trans. from the French with an introduction by Max Shachtman. xii+298 pp. New York. Pioneer Publishers. $2.50.

Some years ago Julien Benda wrote a striking little book called *The Treason of the Intellectuals*. The reference was to the literary prophets, the world reconstructionists and moral iconclasts who noisily strutted their ideals in the security of peace, but in 1914 effortlessly prostrated themselves before the imperialist war machine. The Fabian exhibitionist Shaw toured the Western Front in the company of General Sir Douglas Haig; Wells entered the British Intelligence Service. Upton Sinclair discovered the messianic mission of Wilson. The German professors whitewashed the invasion of Belgium. But the treason of contemporary intellectuals has already outdistanced the infamy of their predecessors. Racing ahead of the very General Staffs themselves, they clamor for a Holy War to Save Democracy. And most conspicuous of the lot are the intellectual lackeys of Stalinism. The depths of their treason are still unplumbed.

Intellectuals who once professionally invoked 18-carat words like Truth, Humanity and Civilization have been converted to the Machiavellian morality of the O.G.P.U. The Moscow trials? It will take a hundred years to learn the truth. There may have been no convincing court evidence but the crimes imputed to the Old Bolsheviks were psychologically possible. If there was a frame-up, it is best for the sake of the Soviet Union to keep loyally quiet. Granted Trotsky is no terrorist, his program of world revolution is a menace to Peace and Democracy anyway. Whatever atrocities Stalin commits, still he is for the Popular Front, isn't he? When all is said and done, the Purges have only killed off a few thousand; over a hundred million Soviet citizens still go about their business. What if several million peasants did die of starvation during Stalin's dizzy collectivization, they were only peasants, weren't they. You can't make an omelette without breaking eggs.

It is this school of Truth that the noble Feuchtwanger has joined. His book is the product of exactly ten days in Moscow made up of interviews conducted through the lucid medium of a translator. But Feuchtwanger is no ordinary tourist. He is a refugee whose property has been confiscated by the Nazis. His novels have dramatized the cause of Justice. He branded Nazi book-burning as a return to mediævalism. He has excoriated the *Gestapo*, mocked the Führer cult, and pilloried totalitarian art, science and literature. Ten days in Moscow and Feuchtwanger is sure that socialism is being built, the living standards of the masses are being raised, and everything else will inevitably follow. He is admitted into the illumined Presence of the Beloved Leader himself and finds that the Stalin cult is simply a naïve expression of the enthusiasm of the masses for socialism. The "confessions" of the O.G.P.U.'s victims he glibly accepts as genuine. The persecution of Soviet writers like Pilnyak for deviating from the Line is a matter of indifference. That no bonfire need be made of Trotsky's writings because they may be read only at the risk of deportation or death, is a small point. Feuchtwanger finds no censorship. Feuchtwanger says, Yes, Yes, Yes, and Feuchtwanger's works will be published by the State in waves of many thousands and the royalties will mount up. Feuchtwanger has become an "engineer of the soul".

That Feuchtwanger's début should coincide with André Gide's break with the Stalinist régime cannot have been accidental. It was necessary to counteract that blow at once. Gide is one of a number of intellectuals who either never lost or who have recovered their integrity. Since he published *Return from the Soviet Union*, he has been subjected to the usual virulent Stalinist barrage. But he has stood his ground manfully. His first book was a series of impressions. He was able to discount the honeyed pep-talk of the translators. The door was sometimes left sufficiently ajar for Gide to catch a glimpse of the underlying reality and what he saw shocked him into a candid reëxamination. His conclusions will be remembered: ". . . the spirit which is today held to be counter-revolutionary is that same spirit which first broke through the half-rotten dam of the Tsarist world. . . . I doubt whether in any other country in the world, even Hitler's Germany, thought is less free, more bowed down, more terrorized, more vassalized." The objection was then made that Gide was unduly preoccupied with the fate of the mind, and ignored the decisive criterion of economics. *Retouches* is mainly an answer to his critics, fortified by much

reading and economic data from Soviet sources, and contrasting the actuality of Stalinism with the program of Leninism.

The significance of Gide's two books lies not of course in their accuracy as works of theory; Gide sets up no pretensions there. What is important is the man's integrity as an observer able to fight off the cloying fog of official adulation threatening to drug every writer who visits the U.S.S.R. The great "cultural front" that Stalinism built up during the years of the Five Year Plan is beginning to crack and the single biggest hammer-blow was struck by the Moscow trials. Stalin has been so successful in the art of "managing" the intellectuals either by flattery or bribery that he has become too contemptuous of them. The special privileges that writers enjoyed in the Soviet Union, the royalties, the salaries, the automobiles, the country-houses, were Stalin's crafty means of guaranteeing an airtight censorship. Deadened consciences made the task of the police easier. Gide shows that the human mind will survive even Stalin. There is still enough of the spirit of scientific research and respect for truth, of that idealism to which Trotsky paid tribute in Dewey, to encourage the hope that an increasing number of intellectuals will take their stand with the revolutionary working class against the totalitarianisms of both Hitler and Stalin.

One of the sources upon which Gide draws for confirmation is Yvon, a French worker who spent eleven years in the Soviet Union both at the bench and in a managerial capacity. Regardless of his conclusions which we find inacceptable, Yvon's pamphlet is valuable for the light it throws on the cold facts. These facts completely deflate the official myth that the Soviet Union has "already entered upon the final and irrevocable victory of socialism", a myth serving to justify the ends of unscrupulous reaction and the bloody suppression of all criticism and opposition. Especially do we recommend these facts to the "social worker" who becomes an expert on the Soviet Union on the strength of having peered at the inevitable crèche, to the visiting professor who avidly jots down notes for a book on progressive educational institutions that will be relegated to limbo by the time of his return home, and not least to the Webbs weaving their endless coccoons from official Soviet blue books.

It is not a pretty picture that Yvon draws of the housing, food, wages, and working conditions of the Soviet factory worker. The new apartment houses photograph as impressively as the giant plants that inspired Miss Bourke-White's trick camera shots. The trouble with those magnificent photographs was that they didn't tell you whether the newly erected plant worked. The new apartments are reserved for the bureaucracy, specialists, army officers, soul engineers. Those still higher in the social scale live in "private pavilions". Personal servants of the bureaucrats have special quarters. The Stakhanovite has the newly built "common house". The prevailing system of housing for the "common worker" is the wooden barracks whose single rooms contain from 25 to 40 beds. The furniture is of the meanest and ugliest. Ten percent of the worker's wages goes for rent. To graduate out of these barracks may entail years of probation as a "candidate tenant".

The ordinary Russian worker's daily menu consists of: Breakfast (before eight o'clock), tea and bread; lunch (at noon), factory meal or when not at work, tea and bread; dinner (5 p.m.), soup and kaska; supper (8 p.m.), tea and bread. Fish, butter, eggs, oil, rice and sugar are luxuries for workers who must make ends meet on a monthly wage ranging from 80 to 200 rubles. The incomes of the bureaucracy range from 1,500 to 10,000 rubles a month, and that applies equally to so-called "party" members. From his meager wages, the worker suffers further reductions in the form of taxes, loans and assessments running from 15 to 21 percent of his pay envelope. The piecework system drives him without regard to his nerves or muscles. "Produce in seven hours more than in seven," is the managerial slogan. The best sanatoria, rest homes, and pleasure resorts go to the officials and Stakhanovites. For their two weeks' holiday, the rank and file are herded and regimented in dormitories of the "barracks of rest".

Even more dismal, of course, is the recital of the deprivation of the workers' political liberties. The régime of the "internal passport". Never-ending surveillance by the O.G.P.U. Universal mutual espionage of Soviet citizens encouraged as the highest morality. The system of hostages. Re-introduction of military ranks. Totalitarian "elections" with the opposition eliminated by the firing squad. Capital punishment. Concentration camps. Liquidation of Soviets. Bureaucratization of trade unions. Stalinist absolutism.

Such were the conditions which another worker, this time an American, encountered. Fred Beal is of the authentic American proletariat, a mill-worker from his earliest youth. He led strikes, he marshalled picket lines, he organized demonstrations. He joined the Communist Party in the days before it was *de rigeur* for the Y.C.L. to scrub the statue of Nathan Hale and for Browder to lead in the singing of the "Stars and Stripes". For his part in the famous Gastonia strike, Beal was sentenced to twenty years. While out on bail, along with the other co-defendants he sought sanctuary in the Soviet Union. What he witnessed there made him revolt. He saw the degeneration of the once revolutionary Comintern at close quarters. He witnessed one of the great fake demonstration trials. He lived through the period of the Stalin-made famine of 1930-1933 and ran across graves with inscriptions: "I love Stalin. Bury him here as soon as possible". But when Beal, honest to his finger tips, expressed his mounting sense of horror he was told roughly and menacingly to hold his tongue. "This is not Union Square."

He determined "to make a complete break with the Stalin gang and return to the capitalist world, no matter what the consequences would be". But not to make his peace with the capitalist world. He escaped to the United States where his twenty-year sentence in North Carolina may catch up with him any day. He is on the run. Yet a liberal conspiracy of silence has been built up around his case. The officials of the Communist Party would doubtless enjoy seeing Beal arrested. One of their scribblers, Joseph Freeman, has already tipped off the police. Friendless and hunted, Beal, no giant of tactics, made the mistake of prejudicing his situation by writing up his experiences in the Hearst press. But who are the one hundred percent Bolsheviks of the Civil Liberties Union to point the finger of scorn at Beal? What right have these petty bourgeois elements to treat Beal as a pariah? In the name of what revolutionary principles and activity do the well-padded ladies and gentlemen of the *Nation* and *New Republic* cast Beal into the outer darkness? Except that he is more articulate, Beal's experiences are shared by hundreds of workers who have returned from the Stalinist U.S.S.R., their hearts swept by disillusion. The country is studded with them, not softies who expected to wallow in Roman luxury, but hard-bitten, rugged, class conscious miners, lumberjacks and the like. They wanted no privileges, they fully expected the struggle for socialist construction. It is a slander that these men are counter-revolutionists. They come back empty and remain silent. But for the most part, they remain loyal to the Soviet Union. Only their closest associates know what has happened. And when they talk, the story is much the same as Fred Beal's, a story of proletarian degradation at the hands of an insolent, omnipotent bureaucracy in the years of Soviet reaction.

This whole period has been covered with great reportorial verve and brilliance in Eugene Lyons' *Assignment in Utopia*, a book that is as sure a product of Soviet reaction as John Reed's was of the revolutionary upsurge of October. Lyons was United Press correspondent in Moscow. Those who read the *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition* recall with bitterness the glib official news reporting that came out of the U.S.S.R. in those days under the names of Duranty, Chamberlain or Lyons. We knew that we were getting half-truths and lies. Read Lyons' chapter on the failure of the correspondents to report the great famine, to present a true picture of the "Five Year Plan in Four", of the dictatorship of R.A.P.P., of the show trials. Duranty is still cynically performing for Stalin in the *New York Times*, transcribing whole editorials from *Pravda* and *Izvestia* as "news". Chamberlain came back and once safely home wrote *Russia's Iron Age* in which he not only denounced the bureaucracy but renounced the whole of Socialism. His most recent work is entitled *Collectivism, a False Utopia.* Lyons, formerly a communist sympathizer, is now working for the American Labor Party.

Lyons' vivid and detailed account of the totalitarian Stalinist régime dovetails at all

points with the political study of the same period by Victor Serge, former collaborator of the Executive of the Communist International. Each from his own point of view illuminates the underlying theory and the processes of the utopian Stalinist attempt to achieve complete "socialism in a single country", upon the basis of its own inner resources and without regard for the development of the world revolution. Trotsky's economic platform of industrialization and collectivization were parts of a larger context of workers' democracy and revolutionary internationalism. Stalin's attempt to force this program into the straitjacket of "socialism" in a single country was bound to lead to results that were the startling antithesis of everything Trotsky stood for. The economic adventurism of the "Five Year Plan in Four" against which Trotsky protested from exile, brought the country to the brink of ruin. The bureaucracy, surprised by the unexpected successes of the planned economy which they had first resisted, drunkenly proceeded as if there were no limits but the human will. The living standards of the workers, the most important of the productive forces, were callously sacrificed. Millions of peasants became victims of Stalin's administrative collectivization. Bureaucratic privilege and social inequality flourished apace. The human travail in the wake of Stalinism was immeasurable but the political consequences were no less reactionary. To unload responsibility for economic blunders and bureaucratic oppression, Stalin resorted to trumped-up sabotage and conspiracy trials. Not even Hitler's *Gestapo* tracked down communists more pitilessly than the O.G.P.U. Camouflaged in pseudo-parliamentary forms, a new despotism arose in the Kremlin. Stalinism produced a totalitarian régime by the side of which Hobbes' Leviathan would look like an anarchist utopia.

Yvon, Lyons and Serge all agree as to the facts. All arrive at different conclusions. No genuine revolutionist will be a party to painting up the situation in the Soviet Union. But neither is it sufficient to set down the stark figures of the poverty of the Soviet worker as Yvon has done, without seeing those figures in historical perspective, and without searching for the basic causes of the Soviet Union's degeneration as a workers' state. At no point does it occur to Yvon that without the October revolution the Russian worker's status would have approached that of the Chinese coolie, and Russia would have become a colony of Western capitalism. At no point does Yvon realize that despite the monstrous distortions of the bureaucracy, nationalized property relations and planned economy have even in this backward country celebrated the superiority of socialist over capitalist methods of production. Yvon is in too great haste to bury the revolution. For him nationalization is a "fiction" and the bureaucracy has become the real ruling class. One cannot very well get out an injunction prohibiting Yvon from characterizing the bureaucracy as a "class" if he insists. But for Marxists a class is definitely fixed by its independent rôle in production and by its special and characteristic property forms. The Soviet bureaucracy or considerable sections of it don't appear to have even a reasonable tenure on bare life let alone on property and its assignment or transmission. Yvon confuses the social parasitism of the bureaucracy with class exploitation. So little is nationalization a "fiction" that after all the years of reaction Stalin has not yet been able to change the basic property relations of the October revolution.

It is only confusing when, in their hatred of the Stalinist frame-ups, honest intellectuals like Silone are led to talk of "Red Fascism". Despite all the gestures of the "Corporate State" the fascist military-bureaucratic state is what it always was, the prætorian guard of heavy industry and finance capital. The control of economic life is more firmly lodged in the grip of Big Business than it has ever been. The Soviet State has degenerated into a bureaucratic-police or Bonapartist dictatorship it is true, but it still rests on the foundations of October. The analysis of the dual rôle of the Soviet bureaucracy given by Trotsky in his *Revolution Betrayed* remains the only key to the explanation of the past decade of Soviet history. Whether the bureaucracy will extend its present political monopoly and attack the economic basis of the Soviet state, or the proletariat will overthrow the bureaucracy and restore workers' democracy, will be decided by the living struggle of forces. It will be decided moreover not merely by what happens in the U.S.S.R. but by the victory or defeat of the European working class. Serge sees this clearly. "At no point in its history can the socialist revolution in Russia be considered apart from the international labor movement—the victory of the bureaucracy was prepared by the defeat of the European revolution."

What has Lyons to offer as an alternative to Bolshevism? The politically shabby and threadbare garment of Social-Democracy! And not even the German social-democracy which once had a coherent theory as well as masses, but the American Labor Party! It is true that Stalinism has betrayed the ideals of the October revolution, but the parties of Mr. Lyons' new creed betrayed the revolution long ago. Had Menshevism triumphed in 1917 the revolution would not have degenerated for the simple reason that there would have been no revolution. Mr. Lyons' present political friends have been consistently counter-revolutionary since 1914, or will he deny it? Instead of utilizing the post-war crisis for socialist reconstruction, the social-democrats worked to rebuild capitalist economy and preserve bourgeois democracy. They fulfilled the terms of the infamous Versailles Treaty. They transferred political power from the Workers' Councils to the Weimar Assembly. They restored the morale of the bourgeoisie by the coalition set-up. They deluded the masses with promises of gradual socialization. Well, what is the upshot? The German socialist party was not even able to save bourgeois democracy. The bourgeoisie rewarded its loyalty with the boot of fascism. The Scandinavian parties still administer the affairs of the capitalist state. The British Labour Party, after two trials in office, vegetates as His Majesty's Opposition, a miserable stooge for British imperialism. But has the social-democracy learned anything? They are again enthusiastically building up the old coalition under the mask of the new Comintern-varnished Popular Front.

The Russian revolution gave humanity its first glimpse of the workers' state. Neither its course nor its problems could have been charted in advance. Nor is there any gainsaying that its latter-day developments have had a profoundly depressing effect on the revolutionary movement. Stalin's crimes have served to throw discredit on the proletarian dictatorship and his Popular Frontism to prop up bourgeois democracy. But those who shrink from the proletarian revolution must ask themselves whether they will not be rejecting civilization itself because of its evil accompaniments.

The Great French Revolution was followed by the intellectual rehabilitation of Catholicism, Voltaire and Rousseau by De Maistre and Bonald. But who will deny that the struggle for bourgeois democracy, for free trade as well as parliamentarism, was once progressive? Nobody wants to idealize suffering or want. But imperialism and war and economic collapse are a harsh school of political manners and social morals. Ours is simply not an epoch of peace and tranquillity. It is as definitely an epoch of upheaval as the Reformation. Individuals can still find peace but not the masses. The revolution will offend the spirit of John Stuart Mill more than once. The issue of destiny is acquiescence with the course of the imperialists or, with all its hazards—the proletarian revolution. The revolution is not a streamlined Pullman to Utopia but the only, if thorny, road along which all mankind can reach freedom.

Maurice SPECTOR

Subscribe to
**THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH**

The revolutionary youth paper presenting the news and analyzing the vital problems that confront the American youth today. The official organ of the Young People's Socialist League.

*50c per year.* *25c for 6 mos.*

THE CHALLENGE OF YOUTH
116 University Place
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed find.....for a 1 year / 6 mos. subscription to the Challenge of Youth. Also.....as a contribution.

*Name*.....
*Address*.....
*City*..... *State*.....

# The Record of the Democracies

THAT THE FASCIST POWERS worship what Goethe called the inseparable trinity of war trade and piracy is plain as a pikestaff. They wreak their imperialist violence on Ethiopia, Spain and Austria. They pile up super-arms for the day of Armegeddon. They are the enemies of human civilization and harbingers of a new barbarism. All this and more the liberal and Stalinist press pound into us incessantly and it is true enough. But what follows? That we reverently thrill to the sermons of Cordell Hull and march with the New York *Times* in a crusade for collective security? That we range ourselves with "the great law-abiding, liberty-loving powers"? But who are these Great Democracies, these bulwarks of our liberties, guardians of world peace and repositories of civilization? One glance is sufficient to disclose our old friends, the Allied and Associated Powers who saved Democracy from 1914 to 1918.

The opening sentence of a 5-volume history* of the Versailles Peace Conference reads as follows: "The war was a conflict between the principles of moral influence and material force, of government by consent and government by compulsion." Our favorite whited sepulchre, H. G. Wells, wrote, "We fight because a whole nation has become obsessed by pride, by the cant of cynicism and the vanity of violence, by the evil suggestion of such third-rate writers as Gobineau and Stewart Chamberlain, that they were a people of peculiar excellence, destined to dominate the earth. . . ." Said Premier Asquith, "The purpose of the Allies in this war is to pave the way for an international system which will secure the principle of equal rights for all civilized states." England would not sheathe the sword "until the rights of the small nationalities are placed upon an unassailable foundation." Woodrow Wilson issued a proclamation of the signing of the Armistice in which he declared, "Everything for which America fought has been accomplished. It will now be our fortunate duty to assist by example, by sober friendly counsel, and by material aid, in the establishment of just democracy throughout the world."

Now that Bernhardi and Treitschke were cast down and Grotius and the sanctity of treaties exalted, what did the democratic Peace of Paris look like? Pretty much as the terms of the Secret Treaties

*Published under the auspices of the Institute of International Affairs.

regarding the future peace settlement had laid down. In 1915 the Allies secretly supplemented their lofty aspirations by inducements of a more substantial character. Tsarist Russia was promised Constantinople and all of Poland. France was to recover Alsace Lorraine and be given control of all German territory as far as the Rhine, and Great Britain should appropriate the bulk of the German colonies. Italy in 1915, and Roumania in 1916 were both promised territorial aggrandizement. In 1916 Russia was secretly awarded Central and Northern Armenia and lands south of the Black Sea; France was given the sovereignty over Southern Armenia, Cilicia and the Syrian coast, with Damascus and Mosul as a sphere of influence. Mesopotamia was reserved for Great Britain. A year later Italy was promised the southern half of Anatolia. (Smyrna was simultaneously pledged to Italy and Greece!) Though China too had entered the war on the side of the Allies, Japan was to have the forcibly-leased German Chinese port of Kiaouchau.

The peace treaty deprived Germany of two-thirds of her iron, 26% of her coal, 13% of her territory, 7% of her population, 40% of her blast furnaces, 30% of her steel mills, 28% of her rolling mills, and a million square miles of her colonies. To the protesting Germans the Allies virtuously explained that it was all being done for the good of the natives. "Germany's dereliction in the sphere of colonial civilization has been revealed too clearly to admit of the Allied and Associated Powers consenting to make a second experiment of their assuming the responsibility of again abandoning 13 or 14 million natives to a fate from which the war has delivered them." The colonies were thus assigned to those more humane and experienced in the art of their administration. England saw her duty and accepted the extra load to her White Man's Burden without demur.

2.

In 1914 England ruled over an empire of 12 million square miles, one quarter of the inhabitable surface of the globe, and of which area she herself constituted less than one hundredth part. The possessing class of one-tenth of the population of this empire dominated 370 million natives of India, 50 million natives of Africa, and millions of Malay, Polynesian and Chinese natives. To this overseas empire Britain now added Mesopotamia, Trans-Jordania, Palestine, the German colonies of East Africa and Southwest Africa, as well as parts of the Kamerun and Togoland. The British Empire now controls half the world's annual production of gold, a third of the coal, a fourth of the cotton, a fifth of the wheat and a sixth of the pig-iron. British capitalist investments of 20 billion dollars abroad netted the governing classes a return of 1 billion dollars a year. The "Blessed Isle" had indeed won the war. German competition was destroyed and England dominated trade from Cairo to Singapore.

Occasionally the natives, for whose welfare she is a trustee, doubt England's democracy and there is trouble. Concentration camps have to be set up in India, and the extremes of the massacre of Amritzar may become necessary to restore the natives to a mood of coöperation. The "pacification" of the Indian Northwest Frontier keeps thousands of British troops constantly engaged. In 1927 the Chinese went on a rampage against British extra-territorial rights and Great Britain was compelled to dispatch an expeditionary force. The Arabs take violent exception to the British Zionist policy in Palestine, and it becomes necessary to stamp out terrorism by burning their villages wholesale. But enough has been said, perhaps, to demonstrate the high moral difference between British occupation of Egypt and the brutal Japanese conquest of Manchuria. To confuse these would be tantamount to missing the fine ethical distinction between Italian ambitions to replace France in Tunisia and France's replacement of Turkey in Algiers. What Britain finds unpardonable is the utter disregard that Japan and Italy have manifested for the sanctity of treaties. She can never condone a breach of faith. For example, in 1897 Lord Salisbury who suspected that a Belgian syndicate had obtained a concession for building a railway from Peking to Hankow, directed the British Minister to inform the Chinese that Her Majesty's Government had been badly treated. "Unless they agree at once (to employ British capital) we shall regard their breach of faith concerning the Peking-Hankow Railway as an act of deliberate hostility against this country and shall act accordingly. After consultation with the Admiral you may give them the number of days or hours you think proper within which to send their reply."

The status quo created by the Treaty of Versailles was naturally a beautiful thing for the imperialist states satisfied with their holdings. The present territorial distribution of markets, colonies and raw materials was declared virtually sacrosanct and boundaries were treated as immutable. Having destroyed German competition, Great Britain however finds herself menaced anew. Japan in the east and Italy in the Mediterranean give the City sleepless nights. With almost a billion dollars of British capital invested in China, with Hong Kong, Singapore, the East Indies and Australasia to defend, there is every reason for the British government to express abhorrence of those who violate the sanctity of treaties. The Ethiopian crisis sent Britain into a paroxysm of idealism over the League covenant, with what results are generally known. The conquest of Ethiopia, like the present Japanese occupation of China, places England before accomplished facts and negotiations are proceeding on both fronts for a deal at the expense of the colonial populations, with democracy having nothing to do with it.

3.

The other great beneficiary of the Versailles Peace was the French Republic. With an area of 212,659 square miles, and a population of 42,900,000, France exploits African colonies with an area of 3,894,727 square miles, and a native population of 38,668,000, including Algeria, Tunis, Morocco, part of West Africa, Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, parts of former German Togoland and Kamerun Colonies. Her Asiatic Empire comprises the five provinces of French-Indo-China, and Syria and Lebanon, a total area of 331,050 square miles with a native population of 25,660,000. Here too the natives are singularly lacking in appreciation of the benefits of French democracy, whether it is of the National Union or the Popular Front variety. Again and again French troops have had to put down popular uprisings in Syria, Morocco and Algiers.

The restoration of Alsace-Lorraine and the control of the Saar gave France the illusion that the old equilibrium having been displaced, she could replace it with her own diplomatic and military hegemony. To this end she built up an elaborate system of post-war alliances with the other beneficiaries of the new distribution of power, Belgium, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia and Roumania. But the base for long-range French hegemony on the continent was too narrow. The center of world economic gravity had shifted to the United States and France never was in a position to organize European economy. On the contrary, her post-war authority depended on the chaos brought about by the Balkanization of Europe. Every move of French imperialism against Germany from the imposition of the impossible reparations to the occupation of the Ruhr merely accentuated the antagonisms and the crisis. French security was built on sand. The world-wide economic crash finally blasted away the foundations of French hegemony.

As a result of French policy the foundations of bourgeois democracy in post-war Germany were also blasted away, but at no time were the Allies concerned about preserving European "democracy". England was interested in the restoration of Germany's industry so far as it was necessary for the stability of British markets, and the extraction of a reasonable amount of reparations. She was equally concerned about maintaining the

balance of power, since that has always been the aim of Downing Street. The British government, therefore, viewed Hitler's advent with some satisfaction as a means of holding French ambitions in check. France was interested chiefly in keeping Germany in a state of perpetual subordination. Neither of the two victorious Democracies were motivated by any other than imperialist considerations. Although the Weimar Republic had suppressed the uprising of the revolutionary Spartacists in blood, it never was for that reason treated other than as a potential imperialist rival. When the Cuno government attempted to evade reparations payments France occupied the Ruhr regardless of what revolutionary situation might ensue. The German middle class was wrecked and in default of proletarian action became ripe for the Hitler *coup d'etat*. French financial coercion of Austria, when the Bruening government tried to evade the prohibition of Anchluss by framing the Austro-German Tariff Union Pact, helped pave the way for the crash of 1931 in the Reich. It could not be otherwise. The notion that England or France are animated by concern for democracy is fantastic. The imperialist power which only yields a dominion government to Ireland in bloody civil war, and the imperialist power which suppresses the colonial populations of Indo-China, can hardly be expected to foster either genuine democracy or self-determination. The League of Nations was what Lenin called it, "a den of thieves".

4.

One of the most revealing chapters in the record of the Great Democracies was their attempt to strangle the Russian Revolution. Allied intervention in Soviet Russia began in March 1918. The Czechoslovaks were organized. Allied Expeditionary Forces landed at Murmansk and Vladivostock. White Guard revolts were incited. Lloyd George and Winston Churchill strained every nerve and expended huge sums to foment counter revolution in the Caucasus in order to gain possession of its oil. Wilson sent an expedition to the Archangel on his own hook. The end of Allied military support witnessed the collapse of the counter revolution and the anti-Bolshevik uprisings. Yudenitch was driven out of the Baltic area, Denikin was expelled from Southern Russia, and Kolchak collapsed in Siberia. But the famous French democracy continued nevertheless in its efforts to destroy the Soviet Republic. Poland was encouraged in her territorial ambitions and Wrangel was subsidized to renew the struggle in Southern Russia. That counter revolution did not triumph was due only to the heroic resistance of the Russian workers and peasants.

5.

Something should be said about the rôle of the third Great Democracy. No one has expressed it more succinctly than Harold G. Knowles, formerly American Ambassador to Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and Bolivia. "We have been guilty of violating the sovereign rights of neighbors and proceeding contrary to universally recognized principles of international law. We have imposed our force upon weak people, and defenceless countries, and slaughtered thousands of her citizens. We have attacked them when they expected we would defend them." The Monroe Doctrine sets the United States up as the imperialist guardian of South America. Monroe's own formulation has been adapted to the requirements of modern imperialism until it means the right of the United States to declare which is the constitutional party in the event of a revolution in Latin America (1912 first intervention in Nicaragua), and to take over political and economic control as in Haiti in 1915 when the United States reaches the conclusion that the Latin America country is unable to maintain law and order. It is applied to enforce and secure the cancellation of public debts, as in the case of Santo Domingo 1916, and it has been applied when revolutionary ideas are conceived to endanger the private interests of American capitalists (Nicaragua and Mexico).

The same Wilson who was to utter his solemn platitudes about self-determination ordered the bombardment of Vera Cruz when Huerta failed to salute the United States flag by way of reparation for an alleged insult. Vera Cruz was captured by United States forces and occupied for several months. That was in 1914. Two years later a punitive expedition was dispatched to capture Villa. They didn't capture Villa but they spent about $130,000,000 trying to.

During the Great Depression there was an apparent retreat from Dollar imperialism. Roosevelt proclaimed his good neighbor policy. Thus the Hawes-Cutting bill of January 1933, and the Tydings-McDuffie bill of March 1934 provided independence for the Philippines after a ten year period. In March 1930 the J. Reuben Clark memorandum on the Monroe Doctrine reiterated that it would not be used to justify intervention in Latin America. In 1934 a new treaty abrogated the Platt Amendment Treaty of May 1903, abolishing all United States rights of intervention or of military and fiscal control in Cuba. Haiti was relinquished by executive agreement in 1933, and the Marines withdrew from Nicaragua the same year. But at no time has there been any real surrender of United States strategic, political or financial interests. The principal motive behind these concessions was the desire to retain the good-will of the Latin American countries and restore shrinking markets for American exports. Cordell Hull explained the new dispensation in these words, "A new spirit inspired by the policy of the good neighbor was born at Montevideo. It was the spirit of the Golden Rule. . . . We must sell abroad more of our surpluses."

In the last few months American imperialism has resumed its aggressive attitude. The independence of the Philippines is being adjourned, reprisals are directed against Mexico for its oil nationalization policy, and the "utmost concern" is evinced by the State Department about the commercial relations of South American countries with the "Fascist Aggressors". As a measure of reprisal against the Mexican government's nationalization of the oil industry Roosevelt and Hull have decided to strike a blow at the very foundations of Mexican economy. Washington announces that the Silver-Purchase Scheme will be halted. Since metal constitutes 76% of Mexico's exports and provides 13% of her revenues, the meaning of the New Deal's policy towards Mexico is plain. It is the attempted imperialist coercion of a semi-colonial country to prevent her national self-determination, to dictate her domestic policies, sabotage her agrarian program and keep her workers in the U.S. owned oil industry on starvation wages. Washington stands solidly behind the rapacious American oil interests. The New Deal's velvet glove is a thin cover for the mailed fist of dollar diplomacy.

6.

It is nothing but a liberal myth that bourgeois democracy is somehow a guarantee of a pacific foreign policy. We have seen how little democracy there can be in the relations between the British ruling class and the Indian "native". Bourgeois democracy is founded in the economic exploitation of both the working classes and the colonial masses. "Pacifism", as Trotsky says, "stands on the same foundation as the theory of the harmony of social interests. The antagonisms between capitalist nations have the same economic roots as the antagonism between the classes." The theory of bourgeois democracy which is based on the assumption that government is the expression of the popular will implies that there is such a thing as "democratic control of international policy". The fact of the matter, of course, is that no department of the State is a closer preserve of the imperialist interests, the interests of the economically dominant class, than foreign policy. The stakes of diplomacy arise from the interests of the ruling class. The agrarian autocracy of Tzarist Russia ruled by the landed nobility

was territorially aggressive and so was the agrarian democracy of the United States before the Civil War. The Dutch commercial state of the 17th century and the English state of the 18th century were hungry for commodity markets. The industrialized capitalist states of the 20th century fight for investment markets, and monopolies in trade and finance.

The foreign policy of a country like Japan, or of the Fascist countries, is obviously free of control by democratic pressure. But it should be noted that in England foreign policy is equally free of "democratic control". The power to make war and peace is part of the prerogative of the Crown which Parliament has never taken away. Treaties are made without legislative consent. The House of Commons never even discussed the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1907 before it was ratified by the Crown. Nor did the Commons ever have the chance to discuss the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1905. Everybody knows the familiar instance of the repeated assurances to Parliament in 1913-14 that England had no obligations to France until the outbreak of the war when Parliament was informed that the country was bound by the terms of the Entente Cordiale. While the power of the French President to declare a war is dependent upon the consent of parliament, the term war does not cover military expeditions against backward peoples, which permits the President to take in quite a lot of territory. Nor is there any obligation to submit alliances, arbitration treaties, etc. to Parliament. Neither the Treaty of Berlin 1878, nor the Franco-Russian Alliance 1891, were approved by the French Parliament before being ratified.

In the United States where the Presidential power to make treaties is subject to the consent of two-thirds of the Senate and the power to declare war rests with Congress, the Executive has nevertheless been able to evade these checks. If the United States is "attacked" the President may declare a blockade and permit acts of war without waiting for Congress. McKinley sent troops to China in 1900, Wilson sent troops to the Archangel in 1918, and Coolidge sent three warships to Honduras in 1923, all without authorization of Congress. As Commander in Chief of the military forces, the President has repeatedly intervened in Caribbean and Latin American countries upon his own authority. The President has a further device for evading restrictions imposed upon his treaty-making power. He may annex territory to the United States, make an armistice or negotiate a treaty by "Executive Agreement" such as Theodore Roosevelt negotiated with Santo Domingo, when the Senate balked.

More recent evidence of the disregard of the "will of the people" when the imperialist interests of the United States demands it, is furnished by Franklin Roosevelt's manipulation of the Neutrality Law and his aggressive formulation of a foreign policy that is the opposite of the "isolationism" implied in the popular support for the Ludlow Referendum. In an injured tone Secretary of State Hull recently asked: "What warrant is there in reason or in experience, for the assumption—which underlies such proposals as the plan for a popular referendum on the subject of declaring war—that the Chief Executive and the Congress will be at any time more eager and more likely to embark upon war than would be the general body of citizens to whom they are directly responsible? No President and no Congress have ever carried this country into war against the will of the people." Woodrow Wilson was elected on the slogan that he "kept us out of war", but on his re-election he plunged the country into the war on the side of the Allies. In the period of 1914-1917 United States trade with the Allies increased from 1½ billion to 4 billion dollars. By 1917 the United States had loaned the Allies 2 billion dollars. In 1917 Walter Hines Page, U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, sent the following confidential message to Wilson: "Perhaps our going to war is the only way in which our present pre-eminent trade position can be maintained and a panic averted." So we went to war.

7.

All the sermonizing in the world cannot obliterate the fundamental fact that the "crisis of democracy" derives from the decay of capitalism. Consider such a thing as the evaporation of the famous Spirit of Locarno. Signed in the Autumn of 1925 the accords of Locarno adjourned all territorial disputes arising from the Treaty of Versailles. Germany renounced the purpose of recovering her lost provinces. Great Britain and Italy guaranteed the status quo at the Rhine against either French or German aggression. Germany entered the League of Nations. To bourgeois pacifists it looked for a moment as if the terrors of the Versailles Peace and the occupation of the Ruhr were to be dissipated. But the "appeasement" of the Germans that followed proved illusory. The temporary German prosperity of the period was based not on a real development of industry or commerce, but on American and British loans with which to pay reparations and purchase essential raw materials abroad. With the crash in the United States and the end of American and British loans, the economic life of the Reich collapsed again. This also was the end of the Stresemann policy which had worked on the assumption that if Germany loyally accepted the terms of the Versailles Treaty she would be able to recover material prosperity along with her former enemies. German capitalism in fact had only adopted the Stresemann idea as a stop-gap; its revenge for the bankruptcy of Stresemannism took the form of Hitlerism.

German collapse was of course due to the Versailles Peace in part only. Versailles intensified all contradictions of capitalist imperialism by creating eleven new national states, with eleven new national frontiers. In their own way the international bankers saw this when in 1926 in convention in London they declared, "It is difficult to view without dismay the extent to which tariff barriers, special licenses and prohibitions since the war have been allowed to interfere with international trade and to prevent it from flowing in its natural channels. . . . One state lost its supplies of cheap food, another its supplies of cheap manufacturers, industry suffered from want of coal, factories for want of raw materials. Prices have risen, artificial dearness has been created. Production as a whole has been diminished, credit has been contracted, and currencies have depreciated. . . ." Or as Trotsky once put it, far more concisely, "Imperialism is the predatory expression of the tendency of modern industry to tear itself completely away from the stupidity of national narrowness, as it did formerly with regard to local and provincial confinement." The mere restoration of the old German frontiers would not have solved the crisis materially. The cause of the crisis was that the productive forces in Germany were potentially geared for the frontiers of the world market. The real and permanent solution of the crisis lay therefore in the political and economic union of Europe without state barriers, without strangling tariffs, and without armaments. But such a United States of Europe is only conceivable under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and despite the urgent revolutionary situations of 1918, 1923 and 1933, the German proletariat under its social democratic and Stalinist leadership failed to take revolutionary action. The initiative thereupon passed into the hands of Fascism and neo-German imperialism.

The inglorious liquidation of bourgeois democracy in Germany points the roads-end of popular frontism in France, Spain and wherever it is tried. Whatever its form, Catholic-social-democratic-liberal coalition, socialist-communist-radical-Popular Front, Labor-Government or New Deal—bourgeois democracy in the epoch of its imperialist transformation, is utterly incapable of maintaining the social equilibrium nationally or internationally. It is profoundly true and attested by every fresh experience since 1914 that humanity faces the alternatives either of slaughter under imperialism or peace through the Revolution in Permanence. The futility of the bourgeois peace societies lies in the fact that though frequently aware of the economic reasons for imperialism they

propose solutions that are impossible without social revolution. What they ask is the voluntary, self-liquidation of capitalism. Thus they suggest that trade restrictions should be done away with, that embargoes on exports should be lifted, that monopolies should be abolished, that international cartels should be dissolved, that all people should have equal access to raw materials, that tariffs should be reduced, the standards of living raised, and the world disarm. But how all this is to be done without waging war on capitalism is a mystery.

The war against Fascism can only be waged as a class war against imperialism. Between the Fascist and the so-called democratic powers the real antagonism is not of "ideologies" or the political régimes, but of markets, colonies and raw materials. The idea of England or France or the United States waging a war for democracy as a political ideal is nonsense. As well have expected the Russian bourgeoisie to initiate the bourgeois revolution. The foreign policy of the Popular Front is a sheer caricature of Jacobinism. Marx supported Germany against France in 1870 and the north against the south in the American Civil War, but he did so on the basis of the then existing class relations. He was supporting an aggressive capitalism against a decaying feudal order. In the war against feudalism, Marx saw a way to the victory of democracy as the prerequisite for the victory of the working class movement. The reformists tried to exploit Marx' position of that time in order to justify their own support of the rival imperialisms of 1914. But the imperialist transformation of democracy already accomplished in 1914 carries with it today, the Fascist transformation of the bourgeoisie.

The war against Fascism can be waged successfully only as a revolutionary war. Such a war would have been justified in 1923 when the revolutionary crisis was maturing in Germany, the country was splitting up into two armed camps, and the Red army was on the alert in the Soviet Union. Had the German workers fought Hitler in 1933, and had the military forces of the Soviet Union not been weakened by Stalin's economic adventurism, mobilization of the Red army against German Fascism, and the revolutionary war in coöperation with the German proletariat would have been in order. But that is not the kind of war that the advocates of Collective Security, and of the "peace-loving" nations against the aggressor nations, have in mind. In the United States the last war produced 21,000 new millionaires, one for every five American doughboys killed. The proletariat of the Fascist and "democratic" countries equally must proclaim Karl Liebknecht's slogan, "The enemy is within your own country"!

Maurice SPECTOR

pend upon their individual tastes and are not subordinated to their own moral criteria. They learned to subordinate their indivdual desires to the laws of history. They learned not to become frightened by the most powerful enemies if their power is in contradiction to the needs of historical development. They know how to swim against the stream in the deep conviction that the new historic flood will carry them to the other shore. Not all will reach that shore, many will drown. But to participate in this movement with open eyes and with an intense will—only this can give the highest moral satisfaction to a thinking being!

COYOACAN, D. F., *February 16, 1938.* Leon TROTSKY

P. S.—I wrote these lines during those days when my son struggled unknown to me, with death. I dedicate to his memory this small work which, I hope, would have met with his approval—Leon Sedoff was a genuine revolutionist and despised the Pharisees. L. T.

# The Collapse of the New Deal

FIVE YEARS HAVE passed since the inauguration of the New Deal and what is the celebrated State of the Union? The level of industrial production in March of this year stood at 37 per cent below last year's. Production plunged from 1929 to 1933 levels, in the brief span of a single year, a feat the Hoover Administration took three years to chalk up. Quoted stock values on the New York Stock Exchange were reduced by $27,000,000,000 in the course of a year. Steel is working at 30 per cent capacity. The purchasing power of the farm dollar is 25 per cent less than a year ago. The ranks of the unemployed have swollen to thirteen million. All in all, it would seem, a singularly inappropriate moment for the *Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt* to appear! The five volumes successively bear these titles: *The Genesis of the New Deal, 1928-1932; the Year of the Crisis, 1933; The Advance of Recovery and Reform, 1934; The Court Disapproves, 1935; The People Approve, 1936.* The conclusive sequel to this apotheosis was furnished rudely and without permission of the Brain Trust, by history in 1937.

The precipitous economic decline is relegating the myth of the New Deal to a place alongside its predecessor, the illusion of the New Era (1923-29). The economic millenium of Harding and Coolidge seems now pre-glacially remote. But dewy-eyed pilgrims from the European social-democracy once came questing to those shores for the secret of eternal prosperity. The installment plan promised to go on world without end, the nearest thing under capitalism to the just-pluck-yourself-a-banana economy of the South Sea islands. The supply of American heiresses for noble transatlantic studs loomed as inexhaustible. The learned professors proclaimed the permanent annulment of the business cycle. Poor Marx was triumphantly demolished as a sour German Jew, an exploded Hegelian, or charitably, as another eminent Victorian. It was the Golden Age, Peterkin, and a man named Lovestone explained it as "American exceptionalism". At the Moscow Congresses of the Comintern, the American communist delegates basked in the reflected glory of their bourgeoisie, masochistically proud of the strength of American imperialism.

Until there came a day in the chill autumn of 1929, when leaves were sere and pedestrians trod warily to avoid colliding with brokers leaping from the topmost flights of Wall Street skyscrapers. American capitalism crashed. While the extreme left of society had been predicting this in a general and routine way for years, the actual event found them perhaps no less incredulous and unready than the Union League Club. In the momentous period of 1929-1932, wages sank 60 per cent, salaries dropped 40 per cent, and dividends 57 per cent. Industrial paralysis created an army of 15,000,000 unemployed and 30,000,000 people were thrown on private or public charity.

## The "Roosevelt Revolution"

Whatever difficulties historians may have assessing Roosevelt's place in history, there can be no doubt that he did manage for a time to salvage capitalism. On the morning of his inauguration, the entire banking structure of the country had broken down and the masses were on the verge of hunger revolts. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which Roosevelt inherited from Hoover, took over the functions of Wall Street, pumping billions of dollars into every kind of financial and industrial enterprise, railroads, banks, insurance companies. By the close of 1934 there were 25,000,000 on relief. The country was put on a colossal dole.

In 1934 steel-rail production was 1,008,000 tons as against 408,000 in 1933. But of the 600,000 ton increase, the government lent the railroads the cash with which to buy 425,000 tons. "The steel industry, the automobile industry, every industry that has been boasting about its better business in 1934 got that better business out of Federal funds paid out to its customers," wrote John T. Flynn. "These industries are on the dole. . . . Their employees are on the dole. . . . The stockholders who have been getting the rising dividends and the bondholders who have been getting their continuing interest are on the dole too."

But the "Roosevelt Revolution" claimed more than that it had put America on relief. It promised that it would plan reform and recovery. "Yes," boasted Roosevelt in his Charleston speech in 1935, "we are on our way back, not just by pure chance, my friends, not just by a turn of the wheel, of the cycle. We are coming back more soundly than ever because we are planning it that way, and don't let anybody tell you differently." The nature of New Deal planning was quickly established. It was an attempt to curb the productive forces, by restriction of output and subsidizing scarcity. It was organized sabotage for the purpose of creating an artificial shortage. The Agricultural Adjustment Act was essentially a measure to restrict farm output. The N.R.A. swept aside the obstacles of the anti-trust laws.

Big Business was not originally averse to "planning" and actually took a big hand in framing the N.R.A. In 1932 industry had suffered losses of probably not less than $8,000,000,000 and was thoroughly panic-stricken. In reply to a questionnaire of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce in 1932, ninety per cent of the replies declared in favor of economic planning. The Chamber wanted to eliminate "the evils of unrestricted competition", modify the anti-trust laws, and regulate wages and hours by trade associations under N.R.A. supervision instead of by statute. Big Business wrote the codes. Stabilizing industry meant stabilizing its largest units. Monopoly profits rose. Big Business was perfectly willing to accept all the state subsidies, loans and guarantees necessary. It had no objection to H.O.LC. and the various farm credit instruments where the government took the risk and secured the mortgage-holder, the banks and insurance companies. 1435 manufacturing and trading companies quickly increased their net profits from $640,000,000 in 1933 to $1,051,000,000 in 1934, or 64 per cent. But once profits were restored Big Business demanded an end to government encroachment, a return to untramelled exploitation.

The New Deal is primarily a petty-bourgeois attempt to rescue capitalism by the methods of social reformism. If the present

Stalinist effort to mobilize the masses in support of the New Deal is treacherous, no less false was their first characterization of the New Deal as fascist. Certainly the New Deal contains elements common to all capitalist state-planning and Roosevelt represents the Wall Street bankers in the general sense that he aims to preserve capitalist property. But it must be remembered that the social-democracy at different times also attempted to "control" capitalism by these methods. Examples are available from the experience of Australia, Sweden and other countries. Essentially based on the demands of the middle classes for reform, security and control of the natural resources, and with the organized labor movement in tow, the New Deal is the American equivalent of the Popular Front, social reformism *sans* a social-democracy. Section 7a of the statute requiring the codes to grant labor the right to organize and bargain collectively was conceived as a counterweight to Big Business.

The same fate which has overtaken social-democratic coalitionism, labor governments and Popular Fronts has caught up with the New Deal. Economic planning without attacking the profit system itself, must either lead to the iron rule of the monopolies, or create greater disproportions and chaos. Planned economy on a socialist basis involves creating a balance between production and consumption on an ascending scale by control of investment. It would mean control of production and prices, consumption, wages, profits, and income, of the output of capital goods and consumption goods, capital accumulation and investment, of agriculture and industry. The New Deal could prime the pump but could not control the flow of investment, a control impossible without abolishing capital claims and profits. Tugwell, Berle, Frankfurter and the other Brains thought they could have planned economy without the messiness of revolution. While capitalism was still licking its wounds, they would sneak up behind and before it could say Robinson, they would knock it senseless into a managed economy. That a change of property relations, of ownership was necessary was in Berle's view a Marxist prejudice. Under the corporate system, he contended, ownership didn't count—it was too dispersed. Management exercised control over production. Therefore it was easier to make demands on this "control group" than to put a government machine in place of it. Damn clever these Harvard boys!

## Recovery—Diminuendo

The short-lived New Deal recovery proved an illusion. The Roosevelt Administration spent $20,000,000,000 trying to pull capitalism up by its bootstraps. "It has actually spent more money in five years," moans the *New York Times*, "than was spent in the aggregate by all the administrations that have governed this country from the days of George Washington to the days of Woodrow Wilson. . . . Yet the business of the country has been subnormal three-fourths of the time." The fact of the matter is that there never was any recovery in the sense of an expansion of capital. There was a restoration of profits and a temporary stabilization at a lower level. In the past, capitalist prosperity depended upon the increasing output and absorption of capital goods; under the New Deal capital secured its profits by restriction. The New Dealers were no doubt equally aware that normal recovery starts from an increase in private investment but it was hoped that after government spending had sown the seed of the upswing, increased demand from private sources would replace pump-priming—and so make an honest woman out of the recovery. But when government expenditures were cut in the hope of balancing the budget, the upswing stopped dead. Private capital failed to "take up the slack".

Every depression before 1929 had ended with a recovery that carried economic activity to a point above the pre-depression level. Crises were once a means of actually advancing capitalist production. But when the Roosevelt recession set in, production was still ten per cent short of the 1929 level. The most striking feature of the present crisis has been the complete stoppage of industrial development. There is no parallel for this in American economic history. New Deal expenditures served to prop up the sagging foundations of capitalism but not to restore its progressive economic force. Formerly capitalism surmounted its crises and restored prosperity because of increasing opportunities for accumulation. Today the productive forces are already too highly developed for the fetters of the wage system. The Brookings study showed there was an unused capacity to produce goods of over 20 percent in 1929 and yet 20,000,000 families had incomes below $2,000. But unused capacity exists under capitalism because its use is unprofitable. Most important fact of all is that the New Deal could not solve the crisis for the simple reason that its roots are international. The loss of foreign trade is directly bound up with the world crisis. Recovery in the case of the United States, as of every other nation, depends upon the restoration of markets for normal export trade, and this prospect is more remote than ever. Every capitalist State is placing increasing obstacles to the international division of labor and trade expansion. Since the end of the World War there has been simultaneously a great increase in the process of industrialization and of barriers to economic intercourse. Incessant economic warfare has been waged since the armistice, a warfare that is now rapidly turning to military means for the solution of the world market problem.

## The Social Crisis

The American crisis is thus no longer merely a cyclical fluctuation but a state of decline, ruling out all prospects of a new period of genuine expansion or durable stability. It is a social crisis, a crisis of the social order itself, involving all classes, and every aspect of economic activity. The present depression is a stage in the development of this permanent crisis in the economic and social relations of American capitalism. This by no means excludes the possibility of a revival but one brief and fitful, on a lower level, and yielding to a fresh catastrophe and more grinding depression. What is the last wisdom of the New Dealers in the face of the most recent slump? Precisely the same program of pump-priming that has already failed and is at most a form of relief, chiefly a matter of P.W.A. lending and granting activities. Paul Y. Anderson, a friend of the Administration comments: "The country will be fortunate if half this sum [the new P.W.A appropriation of $1,465,000,000] is spent by this time next year. The amount is too small to have a decisive effect on the national economy." Even if industrial production were again to rise to the 1929 level, we have Harry Hopkins' assurance that the number of the unemployed would remain between six and a half and seven and a half million. The increasing rise in the workers' output means their progressive displacement in railroading, mining and manufacturing, a displacement that, in the absence of industrial expansion, tends to become absolute.

The development of the crisis through its various stages, recurring upswings and precipitous declines, must have a searing effect on the consciousness of the American masses. The revolutionary movement will not have to wait for success until the American workers' standard of living has reached the depths of the German or Italian. American Marxists have in general been overcautious in estimating the solidity and power of American capitalism. There is, of course, no justification for rushing to the conclusion that American capitalism can be knocked down with a feather. But there undoubtedly has been a tendency to overestimate its staying power and to be dazzled by its façade.

The masses themselves are evidencing less and less their old confidence in capitalism. Twenty-five million Americans have been on relief, millions more on other forms of government bounty. American farmers have been evicted and foreclosed, overturned milk trucks and battled the sheriff. The jobless have invaded and occupied the precincts of the legislatures. The ex-servicemen have marched on Washington. The middle classes, their security gone, have been in a state of ferment. The Townsend movement, the Epic movement, Share the Wealth movement, Father Coughlin, are all signs of a changing attitude towards capitalism. The American working class has staged the unprecedented wave of sit-down strikes, in violation of capitalist law and order. They have shown the most impressive ingenuity and militancy in struggle. All this vast radicalization is proceeding under conditions of world crisis and imperialist preparations for war.

There exists an undeniable gap between the objective revolutionary conditions and the political consciousness of the masses. How to help bridge that is the crucial problem of the revolutionary party. The older forms of revolutionary propaganda and agitation for the socialist goal combined with daily agitation for minimum demands realizable within the framework of capitalism, have been outlived. The proportion of the total wage bill to the total value of manufacturing output in the United States has been growing progressively smaller. During nine years only of this last third of a century do available records of the wages and cost of living of 22,000,000 employed workers show any marked improvement. During the whole period from 1890 to 1918, the index numbers of real earnings moved within a range of only eight points. Under the conditions of capitalist decline, with the output of capital goods and capital accumulation moving downwards, unemployment and lower wages reduce still further the worker's share of the national wealth. If in the period of capitalist expansion the welfare of the masses lagged behind the development of the productive forces, today successful resistance to exploitation is impossible without coming into conflict with the barriers of capitalism. Even the struggle for the so-called immediate demands must take on the character of a struggle against the confines of capitalist law and order (sit-down).

The situation therefore demands that the revolutionary Marxists develop a program of revolutionary transitional demands which will at once impress the masses with their essential realism as an answer to their immediate requirements and at the same time present a revolutionary challenge to capitalism. The failure of the New Deal must lead to deeper ferment and disillusionment of the masses with half-way measures and mere reformism. In growing despair, the middle classes may become more receptive to the demagogy of fascism. The sharpening class struggle will undoubtedly lead capitalism to subsidize reactionary violence against trade union movement, crush strikes, and suppress civil liberties. The imperialist war preparations will likewise be used to fetter working class freedom of action. Nobody can foretell the exact speed of events, but nobody has the right, in view of the catastrophic developments of the American scene in the past two decades, to count on an even and gradualist course of the class struggle. The big, immediate task of the revolutionary Marxists, therefore, is to discover America.

Maurice SPECTOR

Some of them—the ill-clad, ill-fed, ill-housed—actually *hate* this America that has Mr. Hicks starry-eyed. Mr. Hicks says that everybody could have over 4,000 smackers per year, if things were fixed right; we've got all the natural resources, and besides, it's a beautiful country, and that's why he likes it. You might come across an underprivileged chap muttering to himself on a windy corner about how he hasn't got the dough yet, and the natural resources aren't greasing his pocket or even his gullet, and it isn't his country yet so far's he can see, so to hell with it. But Mr. Hicks can well answer that this book wasn't written for that particular audience; what he wanted to do was to show the middle middle-class people, who already have their 4,000 iron man and maybe more socked away and who can afford to be tolerant, that it's a swell country. And if you look at it that way, from the vantage point of your farm and fireside, you've got to admit he's right. Just get yourself a fireside and ...ooking.

...me old-timers, who don't keep up with ...s, were a little puzzled about Mr. ...s' being hired to teach up at Harvard. ... didn't know about this book, which ... published coincidentally with the an-...cement of Mr. Hicks' appointment. ... book clears up that little matter too. ...ently, if Mr. Hicks' protestations of ...otism are not all eyewash, and we ... they aren't, he has quite a job to do ...ambridge way. It's going to take some ...g to water the subversive Harvard ...son into a decent red-white-and-blue. ... Mr. Hicks will be equal to the task, if his book is any indication.

As for the old-timers, who wonder what's becoming of the Modern Age, what with such books being turned out, we advise them to peek into Earl Browder's *The People's Front*, if they like their patriotism straight and without the literary trimmings. Browder can't spell quite as well, but he gets the same ideas across more authoritatively and he's got a pretty nifty ancestry too, if you care to look into it.

Bernard WOLFE

# John Bull's Other Hell

FAMINE. By LIAM O'FLAHERTY. 466 pp. New York. Random House. $2.50.

O'Flaherty's latest and finest book is a novel which puts flesh once more around some of the grimmest bones in the history of British imperialism. In 1845 a famine wiped out 729,000 of the 8 million inhabitants of Ireland and drove hundreds of thousands overseas. The superficial cause was a sudden and mysterious blight which destroyed virtually the whole potato crop. The real cause was English capitalism. In the previous century the peasantry had been dispossessed of the fertile eastern lands and driven into the disease-breeding bogs and barren rocks of the "western world". By allowing a half-acre of arable soil to each fifty acres of bog, the English parliament fostered a new growth of population and of stock and grain production, and drained off into England every penny of the new wealth as it was created. The land rentals were raised to keep pace with fertility so that if a tenant put a new shirt to his back he was taxed for it. In 1798, under the stimulus of the French Revolution, the Irish rebelled, and were promptly shot into submission or transported for life. A period of hopeless submission followed, fostered by the swarming priests who wished to keep their own tithes secure. Reviving resistance was diverted by native demagogues like O'Connell into fruitless campaigns for taxation of the landlords. The bloodsucking continued meanwhile; in the year 1844 the English squeezed from Ireland five million pounds in rent, one million head of stock, and practically all the grain grown. It was this strangulation which created the conditions for general starvation when, the next year, blight destroyed the one food permitted the Irish, potatoes.

O'Flaherty's book is primarily concerned with the sufferings of starving Irish in that year but he shows himself fully aware of the causes leading up to it, and he dramatizes also the instructive conduct of the British rulers in the emergency. Peel's Government first saw to it that every pig and cow was shipped to England for back taxes and that those still in arrears were driven on to the roads. Then the Mother of Parliaments lent Ireland money at five percent for a fantastic plan which anticipated the worst features of Roosevelt's W.P.A. and the English Means Test. It was a works-scheme which expressly stipulated that "no useful work was to be performed", neither reclamation, industrialization, nor road-building, and that no peasant still with a scrap of blighted land to his name or a copper saved was to be employed.

Instead, the half-starved evicted males were set to work at eightpence a day throwing dirt down the hillsides to block existing roads. With the pennies they were supposed to buy American cornmeal sold through private traders at incredible prices. A horde of boondoggling English officials, sent over to watch that no landholder got food and that none of the dispossessed did useful work, quickly embezzled the funds. Men died of starvation while at work; those with money bought passage to America; the masses, caught on the putrefying potato lands, existed for a while on nettles and scraps, then died in hundreds of thousands from famine and the plagues generated by it. The mask of Catholic civilization slipped away; men survived by abandoning their parents, by theft and murder, by eating the dogs which had fed from the corpses of their own relatives. Some went insane and killed their children. Rebellion, which could have been powerful a year before, was now impossible except from the most vigorous youth. The authorities occupied themselves with outlawing and shooting these, and with burying the plague victims to avoid being infected themselves.

O'Flaherty does not attempt to picture the whole enormous tragedy but epitomizes it in a cross-section of "Black Valley", a Galway parish of 5,000 people in the fatal year. At the apex of the local pyramid is Chadwick, resident agent for the absentee landlord. A drunken impotent sadist, he acts on the theory that the country is overpopulated and the more Irish who die the better. He is eventually exterminated by a sudden revolt of the workers he has driven into famine. The sole doctor of the valley is a wistful incompetent, a Chekhov type, ineffectual because of his own ignorance, the general poverty, and the superstitions which have clung to the peasantry since the days of the Druids. A kindred character is the neurotic Protestant parson, vaguely altruistic, talking like a village Norman Thomas. His flabby efforts to aid are foiled by the jealous priests and by the hatred of the Catholic masses who are taxed to pay his living. The more representative cleric is Father Roche, also well-meaning but stupid and self-deceived by the Christian dogma "that no cause was worth the shedding of a single man's blood". Only when it is too late, and the Great Hunger is on them, does he see that this precious blood "was going to rot in starved bodies; bodies that would pay for the sin of craven pacifism the punishment that has always been enforced by history".

The focal characters of the story are a peasant family, the Kilmartins. The old man is the world-type of farmer, enduring, ignorant, toiling forever, clinging to the land as "the life that God ordained"—and left to die on it, the last human being in the valley. Half his children had already died from the tuberculosis which was bred, like the blight, of bogs and poverty. One son, Martin, is hunted for the killing of the agent Chadwick; he escapes to the islands and is protected by a mysterious "big man with yellow hair", an organizer for the revolutionary Young Irelanders. Their maxim is that "them who strike a blow deserve to be looked after. Them that won't fight can die of the hunger". It is the stark minimum of the revolutionary principle, renewing and perpetuating itself. Martin and his enduring young wife and child are smuggled on a ship for America; there they are to join other émigrés and return with strengthened forces "to free Ireland".

Incomparably better than *The Informer*, *Famine* has, for obvious reasons, not been similarly publicized by Hollywood. It is not only an illuminating historical study to set against the prissy fairy tales of Yeats and the fake primitivism of Playboy Synge; it is also a finely conceived story, with a sombre unity of theme lightened and yet intensified by passages of idyllic prose. The early love of Martin and Mary recalls the finest of O'Flaherty's early sketches, such as "Milking Time", and there are incidental portraits which are like the best of Turgenev, sharp with oddity and yet carrying the ring of truth. The prose is not entirely free from monotony or from narrative clichés, but the general effect is one of clarity and dramatic concentration.

The book fails chiefly in its inability to

survey the tragedy as a whole, and to get inside the skin of its revolutionaries. To convey the total Irish scene, the author relies mainly on historical asides almost in the manner of Scott, while, within the microcosm of Black Valley, he concentrates upon the types of secondary social significance—the futile petty bourgeois, the aging peasants, the rapacious agent. Least individualized are the outlawed Martin and the yellow-haired Young Ireland who, historically, represent the most heroic and the most miraculous beings of their day. To the endurance shared by others they added the fire and craft and intelligence of the revolutionary. When O'Flaherty proves capable of re-creating the rebellious as vividly as the passive victims of Britain in Ireland he will have arrived at full stature as a novelist.

E. ROBERTSON

WE URGE all readers and friends to give all the support they can, both moral and financial, to the newly-created American Fund for Political Prisoners and Refugees. In the committee are Martin Abern, James Burnham, James P. Cannon, Rose Karsner, Pearl Kluger, Fanny Nef, George Novack, Lyman Paine and Jac Wasserman, all of whom are well known for their activities in the past in defense work. There are hundreds of political prisoners and refugees from fascism whose views are such that they receive little or no aid at all from the existing liberal or Stalinist organizations. The new American Fund has as its primary aim assistance to these revolutionists. All inquiries and funds should be sent to George Novack, Room 1609, 100 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

## Where to Buy
### THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Modern Book Store, 509½ West 5th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

S.W.P., 205 Lissner Bldg., 524 So. Spring St., Los Angeles, Calif.

# CLIPPI

## A Modern

Reviewing *Traitors in Amer* Oneal (*New Leader*, June 11, author, Earl Browder, to the mancer, Ovid Bolus, Esq., whos was encyclopediacal. It emb without distinction or partiality small for him".

THOMAS CONWAY, an Washington's army, and ot involved in a scheme that assassination of Washingto comrades," says Browder Trotsky-Bukharin plot cent sassination of Stalin and workers."

One who writes such st ignoramus, a faker, or both that Washington had lost a tles and General Gates had upon Conway got the idea o ington replaced by Gates. came public, Conway and cronies were discredited, *b evidence whatever of any Washington or anybody else*

Why Browder did not add ton executed Conway, Gat others must always remain mystery. He might just as these officers executed and tion to another.

Browder also writes that gress impeached Senator Blo see "for treasonable conspi *"traitor found protection in which he was a member"*.

This is another falsehoo did not impeach Blount. It that only not impeached him him from that body but Br Senate protecting him! Before be tried on charges

# BOOKS

## The English Worker

SEVEN SHIFTS. Edited by JACK COMMON. xi+271 pp. New York. E. P. Dutton. $2.50.

Seven English workingmen, some with writing ability, have here deferred the temptation to make romantic "proletarian novels" out of their work-life and simply recorded the daily grind and their feelings about it. Behind them is the inevitable editor who has selected the authors and the material confessedly to avoid "any propagandist line". There is a plasterer and a steel-worker from the Midlands, a blast-furnace stiff from the North, a stoker in a gas plant, a sweated London Jew trying to escape the wage racket by running a stall in a London market, a railway fireman who has never been workless, and an unemployed who has never had work.

The representation is lively but by no means broad. The editor promises a second volume to make up for the lack of women writers, but there is a notable absence also of a Scot or a Welshman—say, a Clyde-side shipbuilder or a Merthyr miner. Factually, of course, the book presents nothing that one English worker doesn't pick up from another in the course of daily fraternization at the local pubs, and politically its contributors either have nothing positive to say or haven't been allowed to say it. For workers in other countries *Seven Shifts* is nevertheless a revealing snapshot album of the English proletariat.

All seven belong to unions; in America that would still suggest editorial collusion; in England, as the plasterer says, membership is "a natural act". The plasterers have had one since 1832. At least two of the writers recognize that the present solidity of their unions is due more to a policy of conciliation than of struggle, so that most strikes must now be "unofficial". Less encouraging, but still typical, is the fact that each is still organized on a craft basis.

Pride of craft is, in fact, as strong in them as pride of class and the two feelings sometimes support, sometimes interfere with each other. The plasterer rightly boasts that no machine can yet replace the skill of his hand with a simple trowel but it's the bosses who can grin when he races with his mates to prove who's the best man, or when steel workers kid themselves into 50 hours overtime in a week out of a bravado of endurance, or a machinist works on, for the same reason, with a finger nail torn away. Class solidarity protects the railwayman whose fellows see him drinking on the job, but craft vanity ostracizes him if he stays sober and makes mistakes or if he doesn't occasionally beat the time-table in.

More potent to make them sweat is of course that universal spectre, fear of the sack. The plasterer, for all his hoary union, works under the shadow of a two-hour notice; the steel-man has had his bouts of unemployment and expects more. Just what they mean can be learned from the bitter Odyssey of Oxley, who has been looking for work since the War. "The staple diet of the unemployed is committees." When the Means Test has made sure you are naked of goods and relatives, it may allow you about $4 a week in exchange for digging holes and filling them in again (literally). If you are married you won't even be allowed to perform that sprightly labor; you will sit and rot with your family, physically just alive, mentally dying, industrially dead. A workless pal went fifteen years before developing persecution mania; some don't take so long to reach the asylum or the graveyard. Americans may read their own future here, once the advancing spear of the depression pricks the W.P.A. bubbles.

The American worker ought likewise to take warning rather than pride from the wage levels accepted by these seven as normal. Add a generous one-quarter to their figures, which will more than cover differences in living costs, and the English plasterer still clears less than $20 a week when working, and the railway firemen, on a crack passenger run, less than $25 for a steady seven days.

For this each must suffer the diseases of his occupation. The plasterer left his first job as doffer in a cotton-mill because he was being sweated down into a "human whippet"; now he suffers from chronic colds, bronchitis, and lime in the eyes. The hulking barrow-men in the blast furnaces grow misshapen from lifting too much; the feet of the fireman are being crippled by the torrid engine-plates.

On this subject the seven are naturally eloquent and for the most part they write with factualness and energy and slangy good humor, as workers do. But most of them fail to explain clearly the technique of their work, mainly because literary exposition is itself a technique, a craft which they have had little occasion or opportunity to learn. Instead there is much diffuseness, repetition, jargon, and a good deal of feeble literary wit characteristic rather of their Sunday newspapers than of their own pub-language. The editor tells us that two of the contributors have already published books; unfortunately it is not difficult to guess which two. Some of the other chapters cry out for an editor whose conscience is more literary and less political.

Above all, the book needs one good tough cockney bus-conductor to come out and confess actual membership in the Labour party and give his reasons for it. As it is, all seven whisper socialism and not one belongs anywhere, thanks to the editor's (and the publisher's?) distaste for "propaganda"; certainly more than one in every seven English proletarians is an adherent of some working-class party. Here the nearest to the doctrinaire is the plasterer, who is a potential sucker for the People's Front and a union of democracies to make something or other safe. But he says his "individualism" prevents him from "irksome" party membership. The unemployed man remembers learning some Marxism from a C.P. study class in 1920, but he concludes like a *New Statesman* editorialist with a despairing enquiry as to how both classes can be "wakened" to their evidently mutual "responsibilities". The socialist gas-worker expects to be pushed off at the boneyard, by accident, lay-off or old age, but in the meantime there's beer and—"well, that's a working lad's life anyway". Blumenfeld and his fellow costers sit bleakly, "incarcerated in a decaying market. . . . Outcasts too, waiting for the sun". The blast-furnaceman growls at the chiselers, including the parsons, but he still speaks confidently of Our Empire and doubtfully of women suffrage. Sure, he's a socialist too. The fireman knows he was led up the garden in the 1926 upheaval (he refers to it, excellently, as the *First* General Strike) and again by the L.P. in Parliament; he knows the labor aristocrat is still only "hired help", but he ends, like the others, waiting for the time when "we really are wanted" to help run things. The only one who gnaws free of the editorial mufflers is Stirling, the steel-man. He prophecies a revolution within a decade. "And the workers will take charge of it, and they will shape it the way they want to shape it. . . . I hope you will like it when it comes, damn your eyes."

For the lack of any voice from those who are actually trying to make this revolution, even in a nice peaceful Clement Attlee style, Editor Common bears responsibility. For other gaps in the record—for an almost complete obliviousness of anything outside the tight little isle, and for a drouth of any really good hating, any *saeva indignatio,* one can blame also an editor who is a propagandist for non-propaganda. But it is sadly true that not even Mr. Common is responsible for all of it. There is still something insidious about British imperialism, or British rains, or the fish-and-chip diet, which makes the average English worker learn socialism from his father's knee and yet continue to be fall-guys for both the *Daily Herald* and the multitudinous Royal Family.

E. ROBERTSON

## Halting Progress

INTELLIGENT INDIVIDUAL AND
By P. W. BRIDGMAN. 305 pp. New Y
millan Co. $2.50.

The decline of a society is pa
marked by intellectual and mor
themselves expressions of the deep
terrible social crisis. The phys
comes painfully aware of the shor
of traditional physical ideas and
dology; the moralist hews under tr
morality to reveal its rotten core o

# Canada and World Politics

THE AMERICAN PRESS has maintained a picture of Canada as a vague snowy area to the north, sparsely populated by French-Canadian loggers, half-breed trappers, backward farmers, mounties, the Dionne quintuplets, and a few English colonials who, because of an unaccountable allegiance to King George, have not yet emigrated to the United States. So dependent are the Canadians on their neighbor's periodicals that they have come to share some of these illusions about themselves. The economic facts are somewhat different, though by no means less curious or unusual.

In the first place Canada is no longer an agricultural country, strictly speaking. Although she still leads the world in wheat exports, her agricultural production in 1936 was but 26% of the net production value; only one million people were engaged that year in farming, as compared with two and a half million wage- and salary-workers. Almost unnoticed by its self-occupied big brother, Canada has undergone a parallel industrial transformation. In 1871 all but 12% of Canada's population was rural; today 55% is urban.

It is true that most of the Dominion's enormous surface is still wilderness, or thinly settled under semi-frontier conditions, and that the total population of 11 million is fantastically tiny in comparison with America's 130 million in a slightly smaller area. But it is also a fact that five cities scattered along a 3000-mile line alone contain 2½ of those 11 millions. In Canada features of combined development are everywhere. Side by side with a continued primary exploitation of mines, timber, fisheries, and land, there exists an expanding series of highly developed and rationalized industrial centres and a corresponding migration from the soil. In the years between 1923 and 1930 (which include even the beginning of the depression and the virtual freeze-up of immigration) the industrial proletariat multiplied at the rate of 20,000 a year, and half of this increase was taken up by plants employing more than 500 workers.

## Land of Monopolies

Another popular misconception, and here one which the Canadian capitalists do not attempt to dispel, is that, compared with the United States, Canada is less ridden with trusts, combines, and corporations. Actually, and again in line with the laws of combined development, the reverse is true. There is no other country in the world where finance capitalism is so centralized. The land of the maple is also the land of monopoly.

Banking is much more openly and legally concentrated in Canada than in the U.S. No local or even provincial concerns are permitted; the field is staked out by ten national companies whose total combined assets were listed in 1936 as 3¼ billions. Of this highly respectable sum, 81% is cornered by the four leading firms, (Montreal, Royal, Commerce, and Nova Scotia). The natural capitalist process of interlocking directorates within these combines has been both consecrated and stimulated by the creation of a "national" Bank of Canada, that is by a pooling of representative directors from the existing banks.

In sharp contrast to the U.S., Canada has not experienced a single bank failure throughout the depression. This does not indicate a superior healthiness in Canadian capitalism but simply that the banking system is so enmeshed with it that the two must stand or fall together. The Big Four among the banks hog, among other things, 75% of all trust-company and 50% of all insurance-company holdings. The extent of their immediate tie-up with mines and manufacture cannot be accurately estimated, but a study of the names on directors' boards alone would suggest that the banks own about 75% of Canadian industry.

These industrial octopi are in turn individually husky and yet amazingly entangled. Virtually all chemical, rubber, and munition products are the sinecure of one company, Canadian Chemical Industries Limited. Corresponding monopolies are vested in the Bell Telephone, The Steel Co. of Canada, and Canada Packers Ltd. Canadian syndicates of Ford and General Motors have grabbed auto production, while Shell and Imperial (*i.e.*, Standard) Oil divide the gasoline sales.

Most ubiquitous of all is the Canadian Pacific Railway Co.; larger of the two transcontinental railroads, it is owner also of fleets of transpacific, transatlantic, coastal and great lakes steamships, and of a national chain of expensive and rococo hotels. Clinging tight to the colossal boodle which it secured in the early railway speculation days, the C.P.R. continues to exploit a string of coal and metal mines throughout the Dominion, giant farms, timber and smelting outfits, and myriads of other concerns. It boasts quite truthfully of being the largest travel corporation in the world. Its only Canadian railroad rival is the government-owned Canadian National, a very sick white elephant whose absorption by the C.P.R. is hourly expected.

The most prosperous of Canadian industries, metal-mining, has also its little nest of trusts. International Nickel not only exports 75% of the world's supply of this basic war material but has corralled also 50% of Canadian copper, zinc, and lead. The enormously profitable and expanding gold-mining industry is not yet so unified, but it is reputed to have created a score of new Canadian millionaires, whose swag has necessarily been secured at the price of hook-ups with the Banking Big Four.

In Canada, as in America, five percent of the population squats on 90% of the wealth. America has its big Sixty Families, Canada its little Fifty.

## Canadian "Imperialism"

Canadian capitalism is in fact so topheavy that its investments now spill over into other countries. Every Englishman is taught that Canada was salvaged from the commercial backwash of feudal France by the British Empire. Most Americans believe that Canada has been salvaged from the backwash of British imperialism by American investments and American culture. Both, in a sense, are right; but what both are being forced to recognize is that the mèsalliance of the two imperialisms in Canada has begot there a strange hybrid state which, at the same time that it remains a colony of both, also acts at times as if it were a little "imperial" power in itself. With no battleships and no marines to back its investments, Canadian capitalists nevertheless have been able, under the shadow of Britain and the U.S.A., to build up two billion dollars of investments abroad. Nearly half of this is sunk in the U.S.A. The rest makes its appearance mainly in the West Indies and South America but also in Europe and Asia. Branches of Canadian banks operate in the West Indies; subsidiaries of Canadian power trusts have fingers hooked in the public utilities of Mexico City, of Barcelona, Spain, and of Rio de Janeiro (Brazilian Traction) and other South American centres.

It may be said that such Canadian investments abroad, and such pyramiding of Canadian money-bags at home, are simply a form of book-keeping for British and American capital. This is, however, only a little more than a half truth. Canadian Ford Motors, for example, which not only manufactures Canadian Ford cars and airplanes but is the controlling centre for the company's factories throughout the British Empire, is actually organized with a majority ownership by Canadian investors. Nor is it easy to dismiss such phenomena with the explanation that

Canadian investors are themselves tied to international banking. That is also a half-truth. In 1934 British investments in Canada totalled slightly less than three billion dollars, and American investments four billions; other foreign stakes are negligible; yet the total of investments in the country was in that same year eighteen billion dollars. In other words, well over 60% of the profit-making concerns are owned by capitalists living in the country.

Unalterable geography, as well as the course of history, has predetermined the triumph of America. Each year's trade treaties reduce the preferences Canada gives Britain and increases the imports from the U.S. Yet the transition has been more prolonged and is economically farther from completion than the average American thinks. It was not until after the Great War that the U.S.A. was able to oust Britain as Canada's chief trader. As for investments, even today the United Kingdom has $2.80 in the Canadian egg-basket for every $4 American. The august House of Morgan must still scramble with Rothermere for control of the pulp and paper industry, and with Mond for the preemption of nickel. Du Pont and the British I.C.I. are battling fists in Canadian munitions; the oil monopoly remains a dispute between Deterding and Rockefeller. British finance continues to stand behind the C.P.R. and much of the country's banking.

## Arrested Development of an Infant Prodigy

The Canadian intellectual may still prudently take flight to New York City for the benefit of his petty-bourgeois soul; but he is an extremely small cipher. A Canadian unemployed, still exposed to the whims of local relief systems, may look with some envy on the salary of W.P.A. workers, but he reads also of W.P.A. cuts and layoffs, and of an American unemployment total that is proportionately as high as in the country of his own capitalists. (Incidentally if he still wanted to take a chance on America there are always enough border officials to spot him and boot him back.) The employed worker sees the long-superior American wage-scale sinking to his own level and the prospects of work virtually nil. The general paralysis of capitalism prevents America from taking full advantage of Britain's failing grasp on her oldest possession. Despite the rich natural resources still to be tapped, the unexplored and metallic mountains in the north, the areas of arable yet unoccupied soil (still estimated at one-fifth of the total cultivable land), world capitalism is unable to complete the industrialization of the Dominion. Consequently Canadian workers, though scarcely intoxicated with the smallish grapes in their own backyard, have little impulse to hop the fence into the weedy marihuana preserves which the Sixty Families have made of the magnificent United States. Canada, the infant prodigy of combined development, is now, thanks to the incurable diseases of capitalism, only an adolescent with arrested development.

The Canadian worker is, of course, being gradually made aware that his struggle is bound up with that of the world proletariat and specifically with that of the American worker but he is learning that mere affiliation with a skate-ridden American trade-union is in itself no more progressive than affiliation to a skate-ridden Canadian one—and less easy to fight against. This is a fact which, however, in no way contradicts the ultimate perspective of American-Canadian organizational solidarity in the trade-union front.

## The Cross-Eyes of Canadian Politics

Political life in Canada also reflects the strange and for the moment unresolvable duality of her dependence. There is no *avowed* pro-American Party and no *open* party of British imperialism (always excepting the Communist Party). For many years the Liberal Party was roughly representative of those less established interests (particularly industrial) which were backed by Wall Street as opposed to Threadneedle. Its mass basis was the western free-trade farmer, and the anti-British French-Canadian. But restored to federal power, the Liberal machine has walked the same tightrope as the Conservatives, playing off British interests against American in order to gain a *pourboire* from each. Reciprocity has never been anything but a political mirage, while *complete* freedom from the preferential tariffs of British imperialism is a thought to frighten even the most Americanized Toronto Babbitt.

The "Socialist" C.C.F. has in its five years of existence reflected the same national ambiguity, playing ball both with isolationism and with collective security. Because it is still a loose federation its followers are treated to the spectacle of its seven federal parliamentary representatives alternately supporting pacifism and the hypothetical wars of the League. At its latest national conference in July the pendulum, thanks to the sturdy pushing of a Stalinist fraction, has swung well over to collective security. But the new "policy" is still a typical Canadian (and social democratic) compromise. "We will support no war of British imperialism—but we feel that peace can best be guaranteed through collective security."

The Stalinites have the one virtue of shamelessness in this respect. So long as Moscow intones that Britain is a democratic nation, the Canadian Communist Party will bear aloft the tribal tomahawk with and for Britain. If the Empire should turn up on the opposite side to Russia . . . but enough of such counter-revolutionary "if's".

Nearest in its foreign policy to the Stalinites is the Conservative party, traditionally the manifestation in Canada of the Holy Ghost of the Bank of England. Yet even the Conservatives, though enjoying the irresponsibilities of their present job as the official federal opposition, are now infallibly cautious in their references to Empire wars and scarcely distinguishable from the Liberals in their phraseology. At their recent national shindig, at which the reactionary Manion was chosen leader to replace the doddering R. B. ("Iron-Heel") Bennett, the Conservatives, after much squabbling, approved a foreign policy which offered nothing more than "consultation and cooperation between all the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations". Where is the old automatic military heel-clicking for the Empire? *Où sont les neiges d'antan?* To muffle the tub-thumping still more, the Grand Old Party of Canada tacked on a "Ludlow Amendment", advocating a popular plebiscite before war is declared. Thus the diplomatic mummeries between the Old Parties and the Old Land barely manage to preserve the Imperial proprieties; in the act of crooking the pregnant Commonwealth knee before Chamberlain each Canadian party-leader cocks one eye at the nationalist sentiment and the other at Roosevelt.

For it is the shadow of the latter's State Department, much more than the annoyance of C.C.F. pacifist resolutions, which puts velvet into the bark of the English bull-pup on this side of the water—and England knows it. Sir Anthony Eden's *Yorkshire Post* editorialized with satisfaction on the spectacle early this summer of the Conservative Bennett and Liberal Premier MacKenzie King competing with each other in protestations of loyalty: "The tie of sentiment remains. The tie of blood grows weaker". But both Eden and Chamberlain know just how inadequate sentiment is to fight Britain's battles if the blood is not only too "weak" to wish to be shed but is connected with a heart located in Wall Street. The ink on the *Yorkshire Post* was scarcely dry when Premier King announced that whereas Canada was willing to increase its production of armaments for Britain (at a price), her own defense was to remain under "autonomous control".

## Canada and Martial Self-Determination

Now for Canada to declare that she will look after her own defense is for a wren to open a threatening beak to a world of buzzards. It is a luxury of utterance only possible when the wren finds herself committed to a perch on the edge of the nest of the biggest and strongest buzzard of them all. That is exactly Canada's position.

For what will happen when Britain is once more at war? Theoretically Canada is "an independent Dominion within the British Commonwealth". Does that mean she has the "right" to label herself neutral if the United Kingdom is not? On that question, which agitates the bosoms of bourgeois nationalists and C.C.F. pacifists alike, both the Canadian and the British Parliaments remain portentously silent. The sister dominion of South Africa has already announced she will determine neutrality or belligerency for herself. There is nothing, of course, to stop the Canadian Parliament from passing a similar and equally vaporous decree—even Mackenzie King has said that she may. Actually, if Downing Street wishes, it can force belligerency upon Canada at the first shot of a British gun, by utilizing the power of the Governor-General-in-Council to recruit, *without the consent of Parliament,* an expeditionary army on Canadian soil. The Governor-General of Canada, nominally a figurehead, still exercises very real emergency powers in cooperation with his "Council" (that is, the Canadian Premier and his Cabinet). It should be remembered that the Governor-General is himself sent over hot from Britain as the symbol of George VI, King-Emperor, in Canada and that the formulations of the last Imperial Conference still laid down the the dominions "a common allegiance to the crown". It is on such considerations that foreign military alliances are made with Britain, that is with the understanding they are backed not merely by the 40 million of the British Isles but by the 400 million of the British Empire. Hence legislation of the Canadian Parliament having to do with foreign affairs is subject to veto by the Privy Council of England which has frequently exercised its "Supreme Court" function to check Ottawa (and to reduce the latter's authority over the various and jealous provinces within the Dominion).

Even if the Dominion's somewhat operatic legislature were permitted to make the gesture of declaring neutrality, international law—which exists in any case only in the minds of the bourgeois commentators—has no precedent to determine whether anyone would recognize the little folded hands of Canada. The deciding factor would certainly not be historical precedents, nor the ghostly League of Nations on which Canada has a nice seat all to herself, but the strategic wisdom, for the country at war with Britain, of an attack on Canada. If anti-imperialist sentiment were sufficient in Canada to force through a neutrality declaration (or if Washington's plans desired it) the United Kingdom might find it good policy to bow, but the declaration would not be worth the fabulous hoot in hell if Britain's opponent found that she could strike at the Empire through Canada. If Germany were the antagonist no doubt it would be to her advantage to respect Canada's declarations so long, of course, as she could continue to sink "peaceful" Canadian shipping en route with supplies for England. That such a procedure is totally consonant with neutrality was demonstrated for three years by the United States in the last war and for the past two years along the Spanish coast by the Motherland herself. If Britain were at grips with Japan, the case might be different. Even if Japan were Britain's sole enemy, which is highly improbable not to say impossible, the British navy would find it impossible to line the west coast of Canada whatever she might still do to blockade the Atlantic.

In all such theorizings it is obvious that the power which really barricades Canada is not herself nor Britain but the United States. Such a plain fact is of course never admitted in the diplomatic pronouncements of any one of these three countries. It is an actuality neither salving to Canada's national pride nor reassuring to her capitalists. In the first place no one knows whether Uncle Sam will line up on the same side as Britain. Kindred "democratic" traditions and Anglo-Saxon heritages are baubles compared with fundamental imperialist rivalries. The Canadian capitalists are fully aware that nothing on earth can prevent their military absorption by the United States once that country is at war with Britain. On the other hand, even if the two powers were allies, the price of Canada's protection might still be annexation, less rapid, less brutal, but yet, in the long run, annexation.

To such a perspective the Canadian working-class is naturally apathetic. There are of course some of the helpless unemployed who would accept any war in order to get steady pay again; and there are some middle-class Canadian limeys who are stupid enough to march off against even the United States at the drop of a general's hat. But the majority of even the Anglo-Saxon elements in Canada are willing to be absorbed any day if such a price is necessary for military protection. And finally there is a fairly solid bloc of French-Canadians, 28% of the total population, and 85% of that of Quebec Province, which resisted conscription in the last war and threatens to set up a separate (and probably fascist) "republic" the moment Canada is involved in another.

The Canadian Plutos can therefore never be free from worry. Small frogs as they are, annexation would plunge them into a very large puddle, populated by the crocodiles of American finance-capital. On the other hand, participation in an Empire War, even supposing the U.S.A. remained benevolently neutral, may lead this time to defeat, the crack-up of the Empire, and working-class revolt at home. But, again, *real* neutrality would mean the loss of the enormous war profits which Britain already holds out as bait. This is a *contretemps* which makes still more sinuous the course of Canadian politics. On one day McKenzie King soothes the pacifists and isolationists and the three million French-Canadians by declarations of military autonomy. On the next day he negotiates with the United States for the building of a $20,000,000 military highway from the western United States 1800 miles through Canada to Alaska. On the third day he signs agreements with the British air ministry for the development of huge bomber-plants, air-training schools, and munition-factories to supplement the British super-armament program.

## The Armadillo and the Skunk

So much for Canadian "autonomy", which is simply running with the hare and hunting with the hounds—while the Canadian worker pays now in sweat, and later in blood, for the impossible game. Seventy million dollars has already been earmarked, in 1938-39, for the defense of a country which no one will harry who is not prepared also to invade the United States. For the Canadian bosses the expenditure is, of course, highly lucrative. It is not simply a matter of business for the local armament manufacturers. MacKenzie King has publicly reminded the whole boss class that arms are always handy, if for nothing else, to put down "insurrection" at home. Finally, it is no accident that Ottawa confesses it is about to build two mine-sweepers and to erect 130 searchlights with five-foot lenses on the west coast of British Columbia, at a cost of two millions, in the midst of the present trade negotiations between Canada and the U.S.

To be sure the recent agreements are threefold, involving Britain, (with Australia also seeking to slide in) but it is an open secret that Britain has failed in these manœuvres to wangle from Canada the promise of aid in war and even the opening up of Canadian immigration gates to that section of the British unemployed who are too enfeebled for war service and whom the Mother Land would like to dump into her favorite colony. (The

United Kingdom has a standing offer to finance British immigration to Canada; last year Canada allowed the importation of only 1573 Britishers; none of them was listed as unemployed.) It is the U.S. which gains when a fortification is created on the Canadian coast. True Britain is not sorry to see them for it is not excluded that she might conceivably (but not probably) be able to use them in a war against the U.S. *Fundamentally, behind every "protective" war outlay in Canada is Washington.* The projected Alaska Highway was first noted in the press as a little innocent scheme of British Columbia's to attract tourists; then there was gentle talk about financing part of the cost in the United States. This summer however Messrs. Farley, Ickes and Assistant-Secretary-of-War Johnson, all of Washington, made special personal trips to the area of the proposed highway; it is patent that the actual plan is the selling of a permanent military corridor through B.C. from the state of Washington to Alaska, with, as a natural corollary, military commitments of Canada to the U.S.

Among the other "autonomous" plans of Mr. King are the immediate construction of two destroyers, mechanization of the land force, fortifications of both coasts, and of Anticosti Island, strategically placed in the mouth of the St. Lawrence. These are the first layers of the armor plate which Yankee imperialism is forcing around Canada. America has not much need for Canada's Lilliputian army, but she does find it necessary for the Dominion to turn itself into an armadillo, a quiet fortress outlining the real boundaries of the U.S.A. in the coming war.

As a military animal, Canada however is not being permitted to remain merely a naïve young armadillo. Britain too has need of her, in the rôle of a secondary beast of prey, with weapons of offense. True, eleven million disunified colonials of questionable patriotism can never bite like the lion; but they can perhaps develop the claws of a cub and certainly manufacture gases as potent as any in the skunk world of modern militarism. That is why in 1938 we find Canadians again potentially offensive bipeds; *behind every offensive military preparation is Britain.* With the collapse of the Swinton air-armament program in England this spring (followed by cabinet expulsions and the scrapping of the shadow-factory system of bomber-manufacture) the British Air Chiefs have been scuttling around the world in a frantic attempt to conscript the economic resources of their not-so-communal Commonwealth.

It is not a new idea. In 1917 Britain was losing in Europe and perilously short of planes, pilots, and air mechanics at home. Canadian factories and training forces, far from the scene of air-raids, were hurriedly chucked together. The present scheme is much more ambitious. A complete census of Canadian plants adaptable to war production is being made, with the help of the Canadian Manufacturers Association and the Commercial Air Transport combines. Both are of course springing with alacrity to the salute, since a quarter of a *billion* dollars has already been forked out from the British war hope-chest to set the wheels rolling. Factories grinding out war machines are springing up like dragon's teeth in the industrial centres. One plant alone, in small Fort William, already shouts that it is ready to produce 1000 bombers annually. The result of all this, and of similar dickers between the U.K., the U.S.A., Australia, etc., is that Downing Street can intimidate or woo Mussolini (according to the momentary Mediterranean weather) with a guaranteed air production of 25,000 planes a year. To learn to operate the new Canadian and American baby-killers, amateur flyers in England are being enrolled in clubs and subsidized at £50 a head.

It is true that the MacKenzie King government is still dodging official British air-training schools on "autonomous" Canadian soil, but it is a patently temporary stall with the well-known cockeye aimed at the wistful isolationist temper of the country; it is a bluff which oozes away as the armament orders pour in and prosperity enwraps the Canadian Manufacturers Association. And again it must be emphasized that King stalls or moves, in the long run, only as America directs him. The skunk half of Canada's divided military personality is not nurtured by the U.S.—but it does not come about without her consent. It should be remembered that Canada's air assistance in the last war did not operate until 1917 when the U.S. had decided to enter as an ally; the first eleven American air-squads to be sent overseas were trained in just such Canadian schools. Exactly what military understanding exists between the U.K. and the U.S. over the present Canadian scheme is naturally uncommunicated to the mere masses, but the editorializings of the N. Y. *Times* on the subject may, with full allowance for customary idealistic verbiage, be profitably studied:

> "Although the question may be raised as to the effect of a strong air force, either British or Canadian, immediately across our northern border, it would seem, in view of the long tradition of peace between the U.S. and the Dominion, and the natural community of interest among the English-speaking people, that *such a force could be regarded as a further bulwark of our defense*" (July 25th, 1938; my emphasis).

In other words, let the un-United Kingdom propose; we, if necessary, will dispose.

## Arsenal for the Coming Slaughter

In the meantime, the Canadian bourgeoisie rolls merrily on. It is true that the second depression which has been setting-in (as usual behind the tail of the American) affects an ever expanding majority of the people. Wage cuts continue while prices rise. Some needle-trade women workers in Montreal have been getting as low as five cents an hour. Probably one worker in every ten is unemployed. There is no federal relief system and single workless wander about the country, alternately striking and, literally, begging. Quebec trades unions and left political organizations are muzzled by the notorious Padlock Law, while Arcand's fascists multiply monthly and drill openly. Four out of every five farmers are in debt, and the average farm income is about $500 a year. But all this does not prevent International Nickel and Chemical Industries Ltd. from supplying death-food to the world. Canada now ships Japan 97% of that busy murderer's nickel, 90% of her copper, 75% of her aluminum; simultaneously International Nickel points with pride to a *net* profit for the first 6 months of the year of $16,732,251. (Last year it was even greater—$25 million.) Japanese gold is flowing in, even, according to recent Chinese claims, for advance purchase of some of the very bombers the flag-flapping Canadian Manufacturers Association is being subsidized to supply Britain. Canadian gold mines are booming; thanks to the smashing of the C.I.O. drive by Ontario's Premier Hepburn, they are virtually unorganized, and therefore daily more profitable for the Fifty Big Shots, their supernumeraries, and their backers in Wall Street and London.

In summary it may be said that Canada, already one of the chief producers of basic war metals, is now to be also one of the muddy fountainheads of the manufactured article, of bombs and bombers, guns, shells, tanks and gas. And her workers and farmers, however remote they feel beneath the Arctic and an ocean away from both immediate war areas, are being inevitably prepared for the job of transporting, using and succumbing to the devices of manslaughter, as well as of manufacturing them for the profit of international capitalism. Precisely where they will be called upon to use them and against whom rests, at present, secondarily with Britain and primarily with the U.S. The Canadian working-class will cease being puppets of both imperialisms only through a proletarian revolution whose victory, also, will depend greatly upon the revolutionary solidarity of their proletarian brothers in the states below the forty-ninth parallel.

E. ROBERTSON

# The Soviets and Democracy

IMMEDIATELY AFTER the accession of Hitler, Trotsky wrote that the issue presenting itself to the masses was no longer Bolshevism versus Fascism but Fascism versus Democracy. Our subsequent critique of the Popular Front might make it appear that we had perversely abandoned this view when Moscow adopted it. That would be a complete misunderstanding. We rejected the whole conception of the Popular Front precisely because it was impotent to combat fascism. The struggle for the democracy vital to the workers could not be waged in a bourgeois alliance for the maintenance of a corrupt parliamentary regime and decaying capitalist social order. The Popular Front was a gigantic piece of political blackmail. The liberal bourgeoisie of France said to the workers: we shall collaborate with you and keep de la Roque and Doriot out, we shall let you have your unions and political parties, provided only that you quit the militant struggle against private property and the wage system, against militarism and imperialism. Otherwise we shall have to let the fascists restore order.

The sweep of Totalitarianism in Central Europe was appalling. At the stage of social development when humanity seemed to have reached the scientific mastery of nature, when the expansion of the productive powers seemed to have made possible the world state, a counter movement arose to set back the clock of civilization, a reaction against the ideals of humanitarianism and libertarianism, against the best traditions of the classical bourgeois revolutions. But especially was this counter revolution directed against the proletariat, as the social class which by its origins and position was the bearer of the internationalist, humanitarian, egalitarian society of the future which had been heralded by the Russian revolution.

Instinctively the workers rallied to the defence of their social conquests and their civil liberties. They felt that the immediate struggle must be for the preservation of democracy and they were right. But their true political instincts and aroused militancy were disgracefully aborted by their leaders. The revolutionary Marxist position has been that the struggle for democracy could only be successfully waged by methods of proletarian mass action that burst the confines of parliamentarism and the capitalist system. It was the class collaboration practised by the German Social Democrats that had paved the road for economic chaos and Hitler's triumph. The parties of the Second and Third Internationals, impotent in the struggle against capitalism, were powerful enough to transform the great mass movement of France and Spain into adjuncts of "democratic" imperialism. The Social Democracy, despite its name, has nowhere been able to preserve democracy and everywhere succumbed miserably either to the demands of the bourgeois democracy or the blows of totalitarian dictatorship.

The urgency of the struggle for democracy as one of the central tasks of our epoch received striking reinforcement about this time from the totalitarian transformation of the Soviet regime under Stalin. After twenty years of the October revolution, the Russian proletariat and vanguard lay prone under the iron heel of a totalitarian bureaucracy. The Soviet superstructure became indistinguishable from the Fascist. The technique of oppression and tyranny was the same, purges and concentration camps. The workers and peasants were deprived of civil liberties, the rights of the various nationalities were violated, the soviets were abolished, the trade unions were incorporated into the totalitarian state, Workers' Democracy was replaced by the hollow demagogy of the plebiscite. The arts were stultified. The revolutionaries were killed. The ideas of Marxism were hounded and driven underground.

The critical elements of the working class are compelled to sum up the lessons not only of the failure of the Western Social Democracy but of the degeneration of the Russian revolution as well. If the experiences of the European Social Democracy prove that socialism cannot be achieved by the methods and within the framework of bourgeois democracy, the Russian experiences show that socialism cannot be established without Workers' Democracy. It was Karl Radek who asserted that socialism would inevitably follow from the expansion of the Soviet productive forces. It was Trotsky who countered that genuine socialist construction was impossible without the democratic control and creative participation of the masses. The totalitarian development of the bureaucratic regime threatens to destroy completely the foundations of the October upheaval. What would emerge would be neither democracy nor socialism. The totalitarian regime in Moscow has reached the point where it is a prime obstacle to the further development of the revolution in the West.

The Russian proletariat could never have been rallied to the revolution in the name of this new despotism. Lenin justified the dictatorship of the proletariat as a higher form of democracy. Every cook would learn to govern. The Soviets would guarantee genuine liberty to the masses, truly reflect their will, assure genuine freedom of the press, of speech, of assembly. In an earlier generation Marx and Engels had learned from the Commune that the workers could not use a state apparatus subserving capitalist ends for entirely opposite socialist ends. The coercive machinery of the old sovereignty, police, army, judiciary, bureaucracy would have to be shattered first. The transition dictatorship of the proletariat would differ as radically from bourgeois democracy as parliamentarism from monarchical absolutism. The Commune would represent a higher stage of democracy based on social equality. The Russian development has been the very opposite.

If the workers are to be organized for militant resistance to world fascism they must be completely convinced that they are fighting for the genuine democracy that Marx and Lenin held out. The Russian revolution was the beacon light in the struggle for liberation. The Russian Bolsheviks once spoke with unparalleled authority. They had, as Rosa Luxemburg said, "saved the honor of the working class". Latter-day developments have raised grave questions in the minds of militants most thoroughly convinced of the bankruptcy of social reformism. What brought about the Russian degeneration? In this and subsequent articles we hope to analyze the various elements of this question.

* * *

For the Soviet Union the year 1923 was big with fate. Lenin was stricken down. A creeping economic crisis threatened to paralyze the ties of city and countryside. The hopes of a revolution abroad were dimmed when the German communists rehearsed their subsequent capitulation to Hitler. The arrogant encroachments of the party and government bureaucracy were provoking widespread discontent in the masses. It was at this crucial period that the first of the great "discussions" between Trotsky and the bureaucracy broke out. In a series of articles entitled *The New Course*, Trotsky opened fire on the bureaucracy as a menace to the aims and future of the proletarian revolution. *The New Course* is necessarily less graphic and more oblique than the analysis given in *The Revolution Betrayed* many years later. But even so brilliant a Marxist as Trotsky could not anticipate the full ravages of the coming Totalitarianism. The main question, however, is clearly defined: could the proletarian dictatorship survive to achieve the socialist society in

the absence of Workers Democracy, economic planning and the international revolution.

Adopted under the pressure of strikes, peasant uprisings, and the Kronstadt Rebellion, the New Economic Policy* was a frankly acknowledged retreat. War communism, imposed as a military necessity had not proven an economic success. It was "systematic regimentation of consumption in a beseiged fortress". Only the material aid of a victorious German revolution could have facilitated the direct transition to planned socialist economy. The Soviet power had otherwise to change its policy or invite destruction. "It was the first and I hope the last time in the history of Soviet Russia," Lenin reported, "that we had the great masses of the peasantry arrayed against us." The peasants had come to associate the gift of the soil with the "Bolsheviks" but the confiscation of its fruits with the "Communists". With no tangible industrial goods in exchange for grain surrendered to the bayonet, the peasantry declared a virtual sit-down strike. In 1920 Trotsky had submitted a project, then unacceptable to the Central Committee, for replacing the food-levy by a grain tax. The economic deadlock continued until a year later Lenin himself sought a way out by introducing the N.E.P. Forcible requisitioning of grain gave way to a fixed tax and free trading. The area under cultivation rose by several million desiatins, and industry received a marked impetus.

But in the summer of 1923 the N.E.P. revealed its limitations. At first the farm surplus was small, the city was hungry, and to obtain working capital, the state trusts sold available stocks at bargain prices. The peasants consequently netted a profit of some 200,000,000 gold rubles. The abundant harvest of 1922 forced agricultural prices down, thus reversing the situation. Aided by the State bank and the stable chervonetz, industry had freed itself from immediate dependence on the sales market. The brightly-colored paper ruble fell rapidly and the peasant was left holding the bag. In Trotsky's metaphor, the prices of industrial and of farm products, like the blades of an extended pair of scissors, tended to draw ever more widely apart. The reaction on the city was inevitable. Trade began to dry up. The banks shut off further credits. Industry slowed down and paid out wages irregularly. Strikes broke out and unemployment increased.

Since only thirty per cent of the pre-war level of industrial output had been reached, the crisis could scarcely be ascribed to overproduction. The contrary was indeed the fact. Should industrial development continue to lag, there was every indication that a better harvest might spell a more acute crisis. So decisive for the stability of the Soviet power, the "link" between the workers and peasants depended upon the capacity of state industry to produce machinery and consumers' goods of good quality and at low prices. But the problem of prices was bound up with the productive efficiency not of the individual factory alone, but of industry as a whole. Slashing prices and extending the benefits of the stable currency to the village would relieve the immediate tension. Unless however, there was far-sighted industrial coordination and planning, the costs of production would again be driven upwards, the chervonetz undermined, and agriculture retarded. An inadequate state industry would throw the peasant mass into the hands of the kulak (big peasant) and the Nepman (private trader). Twenty-five million small farms would constitute too fertile a breeding ground of capitalist relations. The socialist revolution must justify itself in terms of superior productivity. A socialist economy was only possible on the basis of large-scale machine industry and modern technique capable of collectivizing agriculture. But without long-term economic planning this perspective would be impossible of achievement.

This substantially was Trotsky's analysis of the crisis to the Twelfth Party Congress (April 1923), which officially adopted his proposals in the form of a resolution. But like the concurrent resolution on Workers' Democracy, it was destined to remain a dead letter. With Lenin's approaching death, the party bureaucrats were mainly pre-occupied with conspiring for power. Planning was all very well but they did not want Trotsky in charge of industrialization. Lip-service to Workers Democracy was unavoidable but they did not want their grip on the party machinery shaken.

With its limited outlook the party bureaucracy more naturally preferred to muddle along. Summing up the "discussion" as spokesman Zinoviev jeered at "the obstinate persistence in clinging to a beautiful plan. . . . We want transport affairs managed by Dzerzhinsky, economics by Rykov, finance by Sokolnikov; Trotsky on the other hand wants to carry out everything with the aid of a 'state plan'." Lenin had sharply rebuked those who attacked Trotsky's methodical restoration in 1920 of the transport system. "We have before us a real plan," declared Lenin, "worked out for a number of years. Decree No. 1042 looks five years ahead. . . . This is also how to work in other spheres of industry." The bureaucracy, however, continued to underestimate the resources of planned economy. When Trotsky wrote* in 1925 that even with an independent reproduction based on socialist accumulation an annual coefficient of 20 per cent was possible, this was greeted with ridicule. As late as 1928 Commissar of Agriculture Yakovlev contended that collectives would for years to come remain "little islets in the sea of private peasant farms". The prevailing outlook was Bukharin's "socialism at a snail's pace". Trotsky was stigmatized as a "super-industrialist". *Pravda* urged that "the economic possibilities of the well-to-do peasant . . . of the kulak must be unfettered". Bukharin exhorted the peasants to "enrich yourselves". Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, the theory held, there was nothing to fear from the kulak; he could peacefully be fitted into the framework of socialism. The bureaucrats were equally hostile to the Opposition's demand for a swifter pace of industrialization. The 1927 Five Year Plan provided for a growth of industrial production annually declining from the first year's coefficient of 9 to 4 in the last; consumption to rise 12 per cent over the whole period. A year later the "general line" was patched up to provide for an annual average increase of 9 per cent. Only the third project of the plan approximated the platform of the Opposition.

It took the "grain strike" of 1928 to demonstrate that the kulak danger was no figment of Trotsky's imagination. The catastrophically low grain collections necessitated rationing and encroaching on the "untouchable reserves". Unemployment in the cities reached the two million mark. With the aid of the Right element, Stalin had crushed the Left Opposition. The force of the crisis now drove him to appropriate its economic platform. Socialism at a snail's pace gave way to socialism at a frenzied gallop.

Suppose that Stalin did "steal" Trotsky's program would it not be more principled to swallow mere pride of authorship? This more or less was the argument of every former Oppositionist who took the road of capitulation. Thus did Karl Radek write in 1929, "We may be dissatisfied with the tempo, we may suggest this or that often very important amendment but we have no distinct general line; consequently Trotsky must either take a step towards the party or think up a new platform. . . . In returning to the party we do not surrender a single Leninist principle for which we fought." The fate that befell Kamenev, Zinoviev and Radek is itself an eloquent answer. What separated Trotsky from Stalin was not a matter of tempo but principle. The economics of state planning could be properly and creatively applied only under conditions of Soviet democracy and revolutionary internationalism. For this reason the question of the party regime was crucial.

*Tenth Party Congress, March, 1921.

*Whither Russia, International Publishers, N. Y.

That the issue of Workers' Democracy should have been linked up in 1923 with the question of planned economy was therefore inevitable. The economic crisis stirred widespread political discontent. While war communism had been abandoned as an economic policy, it survived in the party regime. Lenin had grown acutely conscious that "we have bureaucratism not only in the state but in the party". To check this menace, he had sponsored the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. This organ of control, in turn, succumbed to the dead hand of bureaucracy. Of Stalin who was at its head, Lenin was writing in his famous Testament that "he has concentrated an immense power in his hands" and was urging that he be replaced in the post of General Secretary of the party by somebody wiser, less rude, more loyal. "Above all," Lenin had been stressing, "freedom of criticism in the party. We have always stood for that in theory, we must now put it into practise." But instead the party regime met criticism by the rigid enforcement of an emergency resolution of the Tenth Congress adopted in the emergency of the Kronstadt uprising, which proscribed factions. Nevertheless secret groups began to form. The "Workers' Truth" demanded freedom of working class press and association and attacked the privileges of the "new bourgeoisie". The "Workers' Group" criticised the dictatorship of the Triumvirate (Kamenev, Zinoviev, Stalin) and called upon the workers to strike. Actual dissatisfaction extended far beyond the limits of these semi-menshevik or anarchist circles. Anxious to preserve the authority of the party and to achieve all necessary reforms through its channels, Trotsky was not satisfied however that the way to stop factions was to call in the police. In 1922 the Twelfth Congress had passed a resolution in favor of Workers' Democracy; unfortunately it had never taken on the least semblance of reality. Trotsky's letter of October 8, 1923 to the Central Committee begins with a reference to Dzerzhinsky's proposal that all party members having knowledge of groupings in the party must communicate the fact to the G.P.U., the Control Commission and the Central Committee. "In the fiercest moment of war communism the system of appointment within the party did not have one tenth of the extent it has now. Appointments of the secretaries of provincial committees is now the rule. That creates for the secretary a position essentially independent of the local organization. . . . This present regime which began to form itself before the Twelfth Congress . . . is much further from workers' democracy than the regime of the fiercest period of war communism. . . . A very broad strata of party workers has been created, entering into the governing apparatus of the party who completely renounce their own party opinion, before whom every decision stands in the form of a summons or command." Why did Trotsky not protest sooner? "It is known to the members of the Central Committee that while fighting with all decisiveness within the Central Committee against a false policy I decidedly declined to bring the struggle within the Central Committee to the judgment of even a very limited circle of (outside) comrades. . . . I must state that my efforts of a year and a half have given no results. This threatens us with the danger that the party may be taken unawares by a crisis of exceptional severity. . . . In view of the situation created I consider it not only my right but my duty to make known the state of affairs to every member of the party whom I consider sufficiently prepared, mature and self-restrained, consequently able to help the party out of this blind alley without factional convulsions."

Under pressure, the ruling group now operating as a tightly-bound caucus drafted a new resolution for workers' democracy. It warned of the danger of a "loss of perspective of socialist construction and of the world revolution" and degeneration of the party workers as a result of their activities in close contact with a bourgeois milieu. Workers' Democracy was defined as a regime of "free discussion and the election of governing officials from top to bottom". The governing organs were not to treat every criticism as a manifestation of factionalism. Momentarily it looked like a triumph for Trotsky, but these concessions proved purely formal. The bureaucracy embraced democracy the better to strangle it. Seizing on Trotsky's comment on the resolution as some sort of breach of cabinet solidarity, the Triumvirate launched a savage attack. Trotsky was accused of attempting to pit the youth against the Old Guard, of wanting to shatter the party apparatus, and encouraging factionalism. The carefully oiled machinery of calumny and repression was set in motion. The Central Conference of party officials meeting in January 1924 formally condemned the Opposition "with Comrade Trotsky at the head of it". Stalin's control of the secretarial hierarchy now made itself fully felt. Trotsky's supporters were removed from every position of influence, and subjected to intimidation in office and factory. Students were expelled from the universities. The Red Army was "purged". Rakovsky was sent to London, Krestinsky to Berlin. A couple of hundred thousand raw recruits, watchfully shepherded by the bureaucracy, were immediately given the vote. The Thirteenth Party Congress of May 1924 was a foregone conclusion, packed by the apparatus men. A few days before, Krupskaya had transmitted to the Central Committee the Testament in which Lenin proposes Stalin's removal from the position of General Secretary. It was a culmination of a sharpening struggle with Stalin covering the last half year of Lenin's life. He had successively attacked Stalin's national policy, his tampering with the foreign trade monopoly, his bureaucratic stultification of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. This did not prevent the cynical bureaucrats from setting themselves up as Lenin's only true disciples. The handpicked delegates would not hear of Stalin's resignation —though the latter made the hypocritical gesture. Unscrupulously exploiting the reverence of the masses for Lenin, the bureaucracy conjured up the spectre of Trotskyism. There began that unparalleled falsification of history that has continued without let-up and has been reinforced by the monstrous technique of frame-ups, "confessions", and bloody executions. Every effort was strained to make the masses forget the political accord which united Lenin and Trotsky—their cooperation in the October insurrection, the years of civil war, the organization of the Red Army, the development of the Communist International. Instead they were served with a steady diet of polemical quotations torn from their context of time and circumstance. "You must understand," Zinoviev later confessed, "that it was a struggle for power. The whole art of the thing was to combine old disagreements with new questions."

Zinoviev was later to rue his part in the conspiracy, to state that the struggle against Trotsky had been the greatest mistake of my life, more dangerous than the mistake of 1917. Amid the menacing outcries of Stalin's henchmen, Kamenev was to exclaim: "We are against the elevation of a 'Leader'. . . . We are opposed to the Secretariat setting itself up above the party organization." Bukharin was to cry out "What can we do, what can we do in the face of an adversary of this kind, a debased Genghis-Khan of the Central Committee." For the defeat of the 1923 Opposition platform of Workers' Democracy eventually led to the complete political despotism of Stalin. The old Bolsheviks were mercilessly exterminated. But first, as the price of membership in the party they were compelled to disarm not only organizationally but ideologically.

Maurice SPECTOR

"IN ITS FIGHT AGAINST Imperialism, the proletariat cannot set up as its political aim the return to the old European map: It must set up *its own program of State and National relations*, harmonizing with the fundamental tendency of economic development, with the revolutionary character of the age and with the Socialist interests of the proletariat."—Trotsky in 1918.

# Is French Canada Going Fascist?

AT A POW-WOW in Kingston, Ontario, on July 12, an assortment of self-confessed Canadian fascists announced their fusion into a "National Unity Party" and for their Big Chief picked Adrien Arcand, henchman of Premier Duplessis of Quebec. The unification ceremonies were punctuated by war-whoops so dreadful the American "liberal" press was aroused to almost a fortnight of jitters before relapsing into the usual somnolence regarding affairs Canadian. The New York *Post*, in a series of reportorial alarums and excursions, calculated 100,000 armed pogromists in the new party, assumed underground links between it and all the goose-stepping Bunds and assorted Shirts of the U.S., and solemnly pictured an imminent uprising of all North American fascism, with bombers taking off from Canadian fields, subjugating Washington, and so, at one swoop, destroying the beloved democracies of Roosevelt and MacKenzie King.

Although the press reaction was mainly an illustration of liberal hysteria adapted to the game of circulation-boosting, it is true that the stock of the heil-boys and their ideas is on the way up in Quebec. The facts can be with difficulty gleaned from the boasts of the various führers. Only a month before the Kingston potlatch even the imaginative M. Arcand claimed but 15,000 members for his own blueshirt tribe; yet this was the largest of the groups making up the new N.U.P. This has not prevented him from announcing 80,000 adherents to the latter already. It is likely that its total active, disciplined membership is less than 6,000, the great majority confined to Quebec; but even this is a force large enough for nuisance value. The various Anglophile grouplets, such as the Victoria Young Citizens' League and the Vancouver Canadian Guards, which for the moment toss in the same bed with the French-Canadian fire-eaters, are scarcely more than paper names tacked to Arcand's publicity hokum, and the same may be said for the shadowy bands of his "lieutenants", Farr of Toronto anad Whittaker of Winnipeg. The truth is that Arcand concocted his N.U.P. in desperation after his own buddies had thrown him out of the French-Canadian separatist movement, in order to re-establish his usefulness for big business. Rival demagogues are outshining him in his own language and he has led whatever dupes he could into an unstable affiliation with any little western jew-baiter who would bow to his duceship.

The simon-pure Quebec separatists continue on their English-hating way, coached chiefly by Canada's aspiring Coughlin, a learned fraud branded with the name of Abbé Groulx, who professes history at the benighted Catholic University of Montreal. The Abbé has a simple formula: drive out the bloodsucking "foreigners" (*i.e.*, Anglo-Saxons), cut loose from the pagan British Empire, and make Quebec a corporate Catholic state at last fit for "Canadians" (*i.e.*, French-Canadians). These views are given the magic of print by *L'Unité*, circulation 30,000, and *La Nation*, circulation 15,000. Paul Bouchard, editor of the latter, is said to take down his back hair weekly with Charpentier, head of the Catholic unions (membership 45,000). Ideologically akin is the National Corporatist Movement with 33,000 supporters in 1245 Quebec parishes, which aims at a separate fascist state administered by the Roman Church. In such a political manure-heap it is natural to find four flourishing youth organizations of the same genus. Although one of them takes its name and program from the Jeunesse Patriote across the water, most of the younglings echo their parents in a repudiation of modern France, that den of republicans, reds, atheists, and church-taxers, and in a compensatory enthusiasm for those great Catholics, Franco and Mussolini.

## Arcand, Fascist Chameleon

Arcand, with his more indiscriminate admirations, embracing the rulers of Portugal, Poland, and Germany (where Catholics haven't had everything they wanted), and his willingness to play ball with the Anglo-Saxon scum, would be a minor figure in Quebec politics if it were not that his eclecticism itself makes him at present very valuable to Duplessis. For the latter is premier of a province which contains in addition to most of Canada's French, a clustre of her very richest Anglo-Saxon bankers and bond-clippers—and contributors to his campaign chest. Hence Arcand continues to edit Duplessis' big official daily, *L'Illustration Nouvelle*, and is in turn protected and encouraged in his own little affairs. These include the publishing of an official fascist muck-sheet, *Le Combat National*, which, under the emblem of a flaming torch, continues to smoke out "international Jewish finance and international Jewish communism". Periodically it befouls the mails with supplements reprinting the fake Protocols of Zion (formerly made accessible to America by Henry Ford) and similar inflammatory anti-semitisms.

When he is not editing, Arcand peddles the same line in silvery lectures to hand-picked police-guarded audiences free of Annie Oakleys, or drilling his plug-uglies in "street-fighting tactics", or getting his lady-like profile photographed for the newspapers. Interviewed earlier in the year by David Martin, he declared with disarming simplicity that he and his boys stood for "God, family, private property, and personal initiative. . . . We believe the Jews are responsible for all the evils in the world today". Once in power, of course, it will be necessary to suppress not only Jews and Reds but "all other parties". "We" would then "declare unionism obligatory for bosses and workers, and organize the corporate state".* Needless to say the "unionism" to be cultivated will be the hothouse variety evolved by Mussolini; trade unions and parliaments are to be replaced by "corporates" wherein a single employer has a vote equal to that of all his employees and the state stands ready to break any deadlock by casting a vote in favor of "God, family, private property, and personal initiative". M. Arcand is also interested in the lucubrations of the Imperial Fascist League in England, some of whose pamphlets he circulates, and he is rumored to be in comradely touch with Herr Kuhn of the U.S.A.

Openly the new Arcand party seems to have made little progress since its trumpeted fusion and one can expect splits any time, what with the variegated aims of the outfit and a certain lack of color and originality in the Chief. Below ground, however, Arcand is preparing for just such an emergency by strengthening his tie-up with the still powerful Conservative Party and other respectably reactionary and nationally more dangerous organizations. In the last federal election he ran the entire Quebec campaign for the Conservatives. Since then it has become an open charge that Duplessis himself is a secret adviser in Arcand's organization, and that most of his Cabinet are members, together with French Conservatives who were once in the Dominion Cabinet and now have posts in the federal Senate. Manion, the new Conservative Party leader replacing Bennett, is himself a good French Catholic, a pal of Duplessis, and, if his speeches are any indication, perhaps also of Arcand.

## Canada's Sudetens

To understand the growth of both Arcand's gang and the separatist French movement it is necessary to keep in mind the

*Nation, Feb. 26, 1938.

fantastic character of the Canadian "nation". Isolated from a natural economic growth within the U.S.A. by a boundary line as arbitrary and illogical as Czecho-Slovakia's, Canada has also a somewhat similar minorities problem. A scant half of the population is British in origin; 20% is made up of races and creeds from all over the globe, and another 28% are French-speaking Catholic descendants of the original colonists conquered by British muskets in 1765. From 65,000 they have multiplied to 2,800,000 in a population of 11 million—a number almost exactly proportional to the Sudeten population of Czecho-Slovakia. Eighty-one per cent are concentrated in the province of Quebec, but while the general Canadian birth rate is falling precipitately,* the French, as befits devout Catholics, reproduce as of yore, and now overflow at such a rate that the ancient Scotch Presbyterian province of New Brunswick reports with alarm a school population 40% Catholic, most of whom are French. All that is necessary to bring Europe's lunatic ward into America's back-yard is for De la Rocque or some other fascist son of the Church to secure power in France, declare a Catholic corporate state, and demand autonomy for the persecuted Gauls of Canada.

Lacking such a champion the French-Canadians are driven to find their own Henleins by much the same economic frustration, national straightjacketing, and ignorance. Almost as thoroughly as the Czechs, the Anglo-Saxons monopolize big business, freeze out the French shopkeepers of Montreal with chain stores, discriminate against Frenchmen in the civil service and in a hundred other fields. It is true the workers are equally sweated by their own Catholic capitalists when these get a chance, but so long as the latter remain a tiny minority, the basis for a fanatical separatist movement exists. Theoretically the French are protected from discrimination by the British North America Act under which the Dominion was created. This guarantees them proportional representation in the Dominion Parliament, national equality of language, religious freedom, and the preservation within Quebec of the old French civil law and feudal land system. The real result of all this, however, has been to perpetuate artificially the racial and religious barriers between the French and the rest of Canada, and to doom the Quebec masses to ruthless feudal exploitation by seignorial landlords and an all-powerful State Church. Made the underdog nationally, the impoverished Frenchman takes meagre solace in bullying the Englishmen within his own province. Smothered by the mountainous ignorance of Catholicism he has been so far persuaded to consider his own exploiters as benevolent protectors against the heathen Saxon.

## Petrified Church-State

The power of the Church is the key to the fascist-separatist maze in Quebec today. By far the largest single landholder in the province, and perhaps in the Dominion, its wealth can be estimated only in the billions. From every inhabitant of Quebec it takes an average of $10 yearly in direct tolls, apart from rents and mortgages. Its political control is open and virulent. The Cardinal, Villenueve, enjoys not only the empty dignity of a joint throne with the Lieutenant-Governor, but also the real power of a backwoods Richelieu, as adviser and even intimidator of the Premier. The notorious Padlock Law was, for instance, personally "suggested" by him to Duplessis. Lesser church dignitaries have their seats in an antediluvian and autocratic Senate —the only provincial upper-house not yet abolished in Canada. The laws are naturally fashioned in the interests of these pious parasites. Church tithes have priority over all other debts and failure to pay them can lead to imprisonment. If a priest decides to build a new church, he may legally compel his parishioners to mortgage their homes in payment for it, and foreclose on them in the bargain. By contrast, foreclosures cannot be visited upon church property, which is also free from municipal taxation and exempt from the operations of even Quebec's miserable Minimum Wage Law.

Petrified feudal privilege similarly allows Quebec's masters to dodge compulsory education, and fill the boards of what state schools there are with the usual priestly *incubi*. English, which was to have equal standing with French, is now not to be taught till the fifth grade; since probably 75% of the young poor are dragged out to work before they have reached that pathetic cultural eminence, everything is now hunky-dory for producing a generation of French-Canadians without so much as a smelling acquaintance with the general language of America. McGill, Montreal's non-denominational college, despite its illiberal governing board, looks like an academy in a world socialist state compared with the Catholic University of Montreal. The 1928-9 calendar of the latter institution expressly warns its students, and their papas, against seduction by the three great Errors: "le materialisme, le liberalisme, et le modernisme" (p. 19).

Clerical control reaches into every phase of life. Only the Church can perform marriages; there is no such thing as divorce, and annulment is extremely difficult unless you can show that your mate was a non-Catholic, when it is quite easy. Women have no vote. Films are so bowdlerized that even the innocuous Life of Zola couldn't get through the border. Those French classics alone are sold in open shops which have escaped the *Index Expurgatoris*. Cultural sterilization is completed by the systematic isolation of the faithful in religious clubs, by sexes and by social strata, from babyhood to senility.

As a direct result Quebec endures living standards as wretched as those in the Deep South or Newfoundland. The long-delayed Minimum Wage Law ignores governmental, church, and agricultural employees, and provides only that fulltime skilled labor should not be paid less than $8-$12 weekly. Since this represents a 25% increase over average wages heretofore, Duplessis is making no effort to enforce the law; it would be too revolutionary. Quebec's timber resources may be endless, but Montreal's slums are the most decrepit in a Dominion generally and chronically afflicted with housing shortage. No wonder the infant death rate is double Ontario's, and the proportion of contagious diseases nearly triple. With a population 17% less than her western neighbor, she uses only 30% the number of autos, and her book circulation is 5% of Ontario's.* The Montreal relief roll is 135,000 in a population of a million—one in seven.

Twentieth-century industrialization of the province has simply increased the economic misery of the French without breaking the hold of feudal reaction. The backwoods Quebec farmer survived for two centuries on second-rate farms by the use of medieval tools and primitive barter; he could not save to leave or to climb out of his class, but he had a certain relative self-sufficiency. Now his sons and daughters, who used scarcely to see $10 cash in a year, are drawn to the money-wages of the new pulp mills and power and manufacturing plants, only to find themselves sweated and starved as never before. The urban population, already 52% of Quebec by 1911, increased to 64% by 1931. Montreal, Canada's largest city, has been growing faster than either Chicago or New York in their weediest days. This has swelled the reservoir of cheap industrial labor, unprotected by legislation and green to trade unionism. Many Ontario manufacturers have actually shifted their plants to Quebec to share in the pickings of an ingenuous proletariat which still goes to mass to hear the priest tell it how to vote.

## The Revolt Against Catholicism

The long-term results which are now beginning to show are much less acceptable to the exploiters, both lay and clerical.

*Births per 1,000: 1921, 29.4; 1935, 20.2.

*See D. Levine, *Proletarian Outlook*, July 1938.

When the *habitant*† becomes a proletarian he frequently has to work with English-speaking heretics, perhaps even secret "reds"; from these he learns that his living conditions are worse than anywhere else in the country and that this is partly to be explained by his extra burden of perpetual tribute to the Church. If he is to remain a meek sheep for the shearing he must be taught that the wolf is somewhere else. Separatist fascism supplies the answer, and the threatened Church the money to organize it. Antisemitism is encouraged to divide the French worker from the equally exploited but more radical Jews of Montreal. It is awkward of course that there is not a single Jewish name or face on the boards of any Canadian bank or trust or utility or transportation company; this can be partly got round by references to the ultimate control by those ubiquitous Jews, Morgan and Mond, but it is eventually necessary to provide a headier propaganda wine than this. Hence non-Semitic magnates are labelled "foreigners" who have attached the French Garden of Eden to a godless Empire. In this manner even the French-Canadians' progressive resistance to British imperialist warfare is used to preserve vestigial Catholic feudalism and the economic suicide of Quebec separatism.

Nevertheless the grim wolf will still creep and intrude into the fold. As early as 1901 American trade-union scouts were slinking into the St. Lawrence valley. In desperation the Church created its own unions, a Federation of "Syndicats", to coalesce the functions of a company union and a Sunday school. For constitution the federation was presented with a papal encyclical of Leo XIII, beginning, "Yes, misery and suffering are the heritage of mankind, and should men try everything in their power, they will never succeed in eliminating them." But slave epigrams are one thing and economics another. By last year the Federation had grown to 45,000 members and its unions were actually engaging in strikes, as in the foundry and ship-repair yards of Sorel. Some of its sections risked purgatory to form joint committees with the A.F.L. to bargain for wage-agreements with Duplessis and even, in one instance, to run a joint labor candidate at municipal polls. Worse, 3000 Catholic needle-trade workers defied hell-fire and joined the I.L.G.W.U. When they also went on strike, Archbishop Gauthier threatened excommunication, but the picket lines endured and the strike was won. Most catastrophic of all, the C.I.O. climbed into the seignorial paradise and with the help of the Trades and Labor Congress led 10,000 textile workers to another strike victory. Duplessis rushed through fake labor legislation specifically barring the C.I.O. and outlawing the closed shop, but the C.I.O., though virtually driven underground, continues to seduce the toiling worshippers of Mary, in the mines, furniture factories, offices, press rooms, fur shops and steel plants.

## The Padlock Law

A parallel reform movement swept Quebec politics but this has been quickly decapitated. After forty incredible years the rotting Taschereau Liberal regime was booted out by a new "Union Nationale" headed by none other than Duplessis and dedicated to busting the trusts, or as the French-Canadians more euphoniously say, the "trustards". Once in power Duplessis quickly made his peace with the denizens of St. James Street (Canada's Wall Street) and substituted the safer scapegoat of Bolshevism. "An Act Respecting Communistic Propaganda", generally known as the Padlock Law, was shoved through an unanimous legislature; this makes it illegal for the owner or renter of a building "to use it, or to allow any person to make use of it, to propagate communism or bolshevism by any means whatever". The definition of communism was left to the Attorney-General, a post which Duplessis took over for himself; in any case, there is no appeal allowed from the decision of the local judge. Penalty for conviction is one year's padlocking of the building and confiscation of the literature involved and anything else the cops take a fancy to.

During the first six months of the new *carte blanche* there was an average of two raids a day, during which several thousand books and newspapers were destroyed. These included a copy of *Tom Sawyer* and some Protestant bibles which a Baptist mission had been nefariously circulating* Significantly the trade unions have been the victims of 80% of the raids, and the offices and homes of the Catholic Syndicalists are not exempt. But since the masses continue to be restless, and apostates multiply daily, the authorities find it necessary to muzzle even the mildest liberals. The apartment of John MacCormac, New York *Times* correspondent, was combed for bolshevism, C.C.F. professors are threatened, and even the microscopic Stalinists are not immune. In vain Tim Buck assures the peace-loving Church of his peace-loving friendship; Duplessis' men continue to carry off the Stalin hymnals and the *balileikas* from the Young Pioneers. When a highly respectable Stalinist member of the Chamber of Deputies was imported from France to speak about "peace", Duplessis arranged with the young fascists of the University of Montreal to create riots in the streets, and used the excuse to ban the meeting. Several Jewish stores were incidentally smashed in the process.

## How Not to Fight Fascism

To these open provocations of reaction the C.C.F. and Stalinites reply only with a falsetto clamor about civil liberties. Under their influence the victimized trade unions are headed off from the essential task of organizing defense squads and persuaded to substitute the telegraphing of protests to the stuffed-shirt Lapointe, Dominion Attorney-General. The latter had, for a certain period of time now elapsed, the constitutional power to nullify the Padlock Law as contrary to the B.N.A. Act, a power which he had been nimble to use when Aberhart's Social Credit government tried to clip the wings of the banks in Alberta. The 45 trades unions and the 63 other organizations, with a combined membership of 100,000, which sent Lapointe high-falutin resolutions about the Padlock Law, were however quite logically ignored.

A typical example of the "fight against fascism" as waged by Canada's self-styled Lefts was provided in July when Arcand held his first Toronto meeting. The Stalinites staged a counter-rally in a hall well removed, at which 10,000 of the faithful, the curious, and the duped were treated to an hour's slamming of Marxism by ex-Ambassador Dodd of Washington. The C.C.F., afraid to sully its petit-bourgeois fingers with any kind of united front, held its own gathering for 800 assorted pinks—also safely remote from the scene of battle. The fascists carried on unhampered; a few Fieldites, bravely cooperating with nobody and anxious for publicity at any price, managed to get themselves arrested by the cops detailed to preserve the democratic liberties of Monsieur Arcand.

Within the C.C.F. the Socialist Policy Group agitates for a united defense organization and workers' guards, but it is a voice crying in the wilderness. Instead, the C.C.F. has floated a Canadian Civil Liberties Union which naturally gets nowhere. For all the legality of the matter, Quebec might set up a fascist government tomorrow and, provided it stayed within the Dominion, receive the blessing of the Canadian Democratic State. On the other hand, if the B.N.A. Act is modified to curb provincial powers, Duplessis has already made it clear he will fight any changes with armed insurrection.

In Ontario, Premier Hepburn, persecutor of the C.I.O., tool

†French-Canadian farmer.

*See Montreal *Gazette*, Feb. 7, 1938.

of the mining interests, and a typical Canadian Huey Long, has formed an open bloc with Duplessis to preserve the profits of the two richest provinces from the begging hands of the impoverished west. These two men are propably much more dangerous than Arcand; they may even be the real Canadian fascists of the future. They are steadily creating a reactionary boss regime inside the crumbling shell of the old Liberal party, and plainly have ambitions in Dominion politics. At the moment these provincial demagogues are putting on a strip-tease act with the rags of bourgeois democracy. Eventually they, or other troupers of the same breed, may wriggle out of the last shred and, to the applause of the capitalist baldheads, the curtain will ring down on naked fascism.

## The Proletarian Road

There is yet time, especially if Canada is not immediately involved in European war, to stop the show. Except in Quebec, fascism languishes until the workers threaten big business sufficiently. But the Augean stables won't be cleaned out with the teaspoons of the old ladies in the Civil Liberties Union. If the C.C.F. is ever to become a party of labor it must be prepared to meet the fascists physically blow for blow. It must give the lead to the unions and to the working class organizations of all kinds in the formation of joint defense squads with a permanent centre and trained worker-defenders. There must be no spreading of illusions that legislative tinkering will halt reaction. In short the party which will prevent fascism in Canada must be also the party capable of carrying the working-class to revolutionary victory. Such a party must be itself working-class. The prairie farmers, a potential reservoir for fascist recruitment, must be won to the support of the workers not, as now in the C.C.F., by wholesale concessions to their sectionalist and anti-labor habits, but by showing them in theory and practise that only the power of labor can destroy the capitalism that bleeds all toilers alike.

The complicated Quebec problem will also be solved only by a militant workers' party willing to concede the right of self-determination to the 2½ millions with a different race, language, and traditions, but fearless also in exposing the role of Catholic religion and Catholic wealth. Such a party will need to fight the pussyfooting Stalinists and all other betrayers who cloak the economic exploitation of Quebec Catholicism with the excuse that the pious worker must not be antagonized. The fight against fascism in Quebec is today *primarily* a fight against the Catholic Church, against the poisonous drugs of its religious doctrines, against its legal and against its political hold on the masses. When that is broken, much of the "separatist" problem will disappear, as it has already evaporated in the minds of those French-Canadian workers who have thrown off Catholicism already and struck against bosses of all creeds. The militants in the Catholic unions must be roused to multiply their joint-committees with the other unions. From this it will be possible to proceed to trade union unification, and, granted a Marxist cadre, to independent political action and unification with the proletarian revolutionary forces in Canada and the United States. That is the only way to say a final "No" to the question, "Is French Canada Going Fascist?"

E. ROBERTSON

# The Popular Front's Guilt

THE PREREQUISITE of sound revolutionary policy is to see things as they are. No little part of the victorious advance of Hitler is the gift of his opponents' inability to give a straight account of reality. How little these illusions have served the cause of effective struggle against fascism! When the Nazi movement appeared, clever liberals said Germany was not Italy. The Munich beer-hall putsch they thought very funny, very funny, what with Ludendorff falling down flat on his stomach and Hitler landing up in jail. The social crisis and with it the Nazi movement grew. Hitler lost two million votes and the German communists proclaimed that fascism was finished. The *Rote Fahne* vociferated that the proletariat was ready to strike at the command of the Communist Party. Hitler took power with little more resistance than a couple of street fights. The social democrats, headed by Otto Wels, and trade unionists led by Leipart hoped that by declaring their loyalty to the Nazi state, they would be allowed to function as a legal opposition. Hitler destroyed the entire German free trade union movement and put its leaders into concentration camps. Undeterred by any prejudice for truth, the Stalinists kept telling their followers that all was not yet over; the revolution would break out any day. The country was allegedly honeycombed with red cells and Storm Troopers were preparing to transfer their allegiance. But the German proletariat kept paying the price of capitulation. The next self-deception of these tragi-comic politicians was in Germany's isolation. Hitler was surrounded by the "democracies". The Reichswehr generals were in opposition. Hitler, however, had taken the measure of the "democracies". He occupied the Rhineland and introduced conscription. He made a deal with the Poles and Mussolini. Austria was taken. Czechoslovakia was hemmed in. The gallant Czech people would fight, the world was next told. The French army was the best in Europe. The Russians had the deadliest air fleet and could drop whole regiments behind the enemy's lines by the parachute route. But the ramshackle edifice of the Popular Front and collective security, put to the test, collapsed like a pricked balloon.

The fact is that the Munich accord is the greatest victory that German fascism has carried off since 1933. Hitler stands at the head of a totalitarian state of 80 million Germans, more powerful than Bismarck, or perhaps Napoleon. Munich was the final smash-up of the Versailles balance of power. The map of Central Europe is now redrawn. Economic and political domination of Southeastern Europe goes to Nazi Germany. The Little Entente is dissolved. The Czech alliance with the U.S.S.R. is broken. The Franco-Soviet pact is dead. The Baltic countries are whipped into the orbit of either Germany or Poland. Hungary will be a satellite and nobody takes the military power of Carol's Rumanian dictatorship seriously. In the last war von Mackensen romped through the gallant Rumanian army in the matter of a couple of weeks, if our memory serves us. The remnant of Czechoslovakia has become totalitarian. The French have appointed an ambassador to Rome. Chamberlain and Mussolini are preparing to liquidate Spain. Barcelona can be transformed into a fascist set-up as rapidly as Prague. The Soviet Union is isolated and to all intents and purposes the German army is encamped on the borders of the Ukraine.

Fascism bestrides the continent; it is idle to deny it. Munich was the grand pay-off for two decades of defeat of the proletarian revolution. In 1918 the German Social Democracy could have chosen an "eastern orientation", a bloc with revolutionary agrarian Russia. The Bolsheviks proposed such a bloc. Europe was still in a state of post-war revolutionary ferment. A union of Russia and Germany would have put an end to capitalist domination and led to a United States of Europe. It was the most natural alliance for both parties. The bourgeois Germany of Rathenau found it necessary to conclude the Rappallo Treaty and foster trade relations. The German Reichswehr found it necessary to seek collaboration with the General Staff of the Red Army. But the Social Democracy contemptuously rejected the Bolshevik advances and embarked on a Western orientation. They decided to fulfil the impossible terms of the Treaty of Versailles, taking on themselves an odium that was to cost them dearly in the future, the odium for the degradation and humiliation of a once great power. But no matter how "loyally" the Weimar Republic kowtowed to the Versailles powers, they were always kept humbly waiting on the door-step of the servants entrance. Otto Bauer preferred the same policy for Austria. In 1923 and again in 1933, social democratic and communist parties evacuated all their positions, surrendered all the social gains of decades to fascism without a struggle. The Austrian workers fought, proving that the rank and file was made of different mettle than the parliamentary leadership. But it was too late.

The tide of revolutionary unrest and the will to combat fascism rose high again in the French labor movement in 1934. The combined efforts of the Socialists and Stalinists succeeded in diverting the revolutionary ferment into the channels of popular frontism. Social-patriotism and class collaboration were sweetened in the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy which had entered into an alliance with the imperialist "democracies". To this alliance the revolutionary cause of the Spanish workers was sacrificed. The struggle of the Spanish workers for their social liberation was prohibited by the united threats and pressure of the "democracies" and Moscow. To all protests of the militants, to all the warnings of revolutionary Marxists the Second and Third Internationals replied that the Popular Front was the way to fight fascism at home, and collective security the way to hold the fascist powers in check abroad. This was the "struggle for peace and democracy". A revolutionary policy, a policy of the class struggle would we were told open the road to fascist aggression; it would weaken the democracies and encourage the aggressor. The Internationals of Social Democracy and Stalinism thus became the most ardent defenders of the capitalist status quo and of the Versailles set-up.

To Hitler these policies of the Comintern and Social Democracy were worth any number of army corps. He no longer had to fear the effect that a revolutionary working class in the "democratic countries" would have on the workers of the fascist countries. The Popular Front's acceptance of the status quo as its point of departure enabled Hitler to represent his opponents as the people who wanted to perpetuate the Peace Treaty of 1919. On the other hand despite all the propaganda for the democracy of "brave little Czechoslovakia", the event has shown that the French workers were little impressed. Millions of workers in both England and France must have had an uneasy feeling that they would be fighting to maintain three million Germans under Czech rule. There must have been many in France who recalled that when a proposal was made in the French Chamber in 1933 to join in the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Czech republic, the Stalinist Peri got up to oppose it on the ground that "our sympathy goes to the working classes of Czechoslovakia and the minorities oppressed by the central power in Prague". He proceeded to accuse Benes of preparing "concentration camps on the model of Hitler's Germany". In the debates in the Socialist party, Paul Faure recently reminded his colleagues that "at the moment when the Sudeten Germans were ceded to Czechoslovakia, the Socialist party took a position in favor of the Sudetens". When it came to the point the French worker proved unwilling to fight for the rotten fruits of the Versailles Peace.

Collective Security proved to be a colossal swindle. What happened at Munich was a more grandiose repetition of the sanctions farce during the Italo-Ethiopian war. The Munich accord writes finis to the successive hoaxes of the Covenant of the League, the Kellogg Pact to outlaw war, the Nine-Power Treaty to safeguard China and all the rest of the legalistic skullduggery that was to lull the peoples into the illusion that "power politics" had given way to the "reign of law", but was in reality a means of sanctifying the existing partition of the world among the powers on the basis of their relation of forces in 1918. All that the collective security talk did was to blunt the edge of the revolutionary struggle against war and militarism inside the mass movement and thereby enable Hitler, with the acquiescence of the "democratic" imperialisms to advance his interests in Central Europe and effect a new equilibrium. Collective Security was as little capable of stopping Hitler as sanctions stopped Mussolini.

Munich enables us to draw a fresh balance of the condition of "democracy". Several years of the Popular Front have issued in the growth of reaction. The *Manchester Guardian's* correspondent confirms this. "The internal consequences of Munich in France are still incalculable. The idea of building up a tremendous defence machine has gained ground and with it all sorts of theories about an authoritarian regime, a military dictatorship, a totalitarian financial system." A hopeful sign is the report that "among the working class, on the other hand, there is profound disgust with the 'Republican regime' as it has functioned in the last few months and a great loss of loyalty to 'democracy'." The danger is that in default of revolutionary leadership, this same disgust with "democracy" may easily wind up in the channels of fascism. Frank Hanighen in the *New Republic* reports much in the same vein: ". . . disquieting results are now back of the relief at demobilization and peace, one can discern among the workers not only a disgust with their clumsy government but also a disillusion with such slogans as 'democracy', 'front against fascism', etc." Such darlings of the Left as Kerillis are calling for an authoritarian republic. The *mystique* of the Popular Front is gone.

The role of the U.S.S.R. those weeks of crisis was a complete reflection of the impotence and degeneration of the Soviet bureaucracy. Nobody has yet explained how the destruction of the political and spiritual capital of the Russian revolution could possibly enhance the authority of the U.S.S.R. in international diplomacy. When Eden was toasting Stalin in Moscow and Litvinoff was toasting His Majesty, when Barthou and Herriot were negotiating for Russia's entrance into the League, and the Franco-Soviet pact appeared in outline, it looked like a diplomatic triumph for the Stalinist regime, particularly after the accession of Hitler in Germany. But all this was a pretentious facade. The complete isolation of the U.S.S.R. during the Berchesgaden-Godesberg-Munich negotiations is the pay-off. While Chamberlain and Hitler talked, Litvinoff sat in the charnel-house of Geneva. At no time was the voice of the Soviet Union heard clearly. Litvinoff mumbled something, Maisky mumbled something. Poland was warned not to take Teschen (which she proceeded to do nevertheless). It appears that the real explanation for Soviet paralysis was Colonel Lindbergh. Against the colonel, Stalin ordered full mobilization (of verbal batteries) and war to the knife. Lindbergh destroyed the Popular Front, Lindbergh overthrew collective security and Lindbergh is the mortal enemy of democracy.

Anyone familiar with Stalin's record of diplomatic "successes" cannot be surprised by the addition of Munich. The famous Anglo-Russian Committee experiment wound up in the Scotland Yard raid on Arcos. The famous strategy of Stalin in the Kuomintang ended with the slaughter of Russian functionaries in Shanghai and Borodin and Galen taking to their heels with Chiang Kai Shek's men in hot pursuit. When Hitler came to power Trotsky's suggestion that the Red Army mobilize was denounced as adventurism (despite the acknowledged fact that the Reichswehr was not prepared to resist had the French marched during the occupation of the Rhineland much later). Instead Stalin hurried to conclude a trade treaty with Hitler. When the workers of all other countries were demonstrating in protest against Hitler's terrorism, only the Soviet workers were ordered to remain silent. Loudly demanding the application of sanctions during the Italo-Ethiopian war, the Stalinist bureaucracy itself steadily maintained its oil shipments to Mussolini. When the Spanish civil war broke out, Stalin did intervene—to keep the working class harnessed to the Popular Front and bourgeois democracy.

But the sabotage and ruination of the revolutionary movement abroad means the increasing isolation of the October revolution. The fear of the gathering volume of political and social discontent in the Soviet Union forces Stalin to his preventive purges, which undermine the strength and morale of the army, the navy, the schools, and every institution in the country. The one shortage that Stalinist Russia escapes is executions. The imperialist powers have naturally drawn their conclusions, Daladier and Chamberlain ignore the U.S.S.R. in their calculations, and Hitler speculates on the state of mind of the Ukrainian peasant—and no doubt also receives reports on the outlook of fascism among the soviet bureaucrats.

The European crisis has strikingly revealed the horror that the masses entertain for modern war. This is confirmed on all hands. The Paris correspondent of the *New Republic* writes: "the mobilization instead of reviving nationalist brio among the people, had an almost reverse effect". If anything more was needed the sense of relief that swept Europe after the Munich conference is sufficient evidence of the desire for peace. Yet in this situation, where the masses are helpless without leadership, the Stalinists, laborites and social democrats were out in the forefront as vociferous warmongers. The Social Democracy of 1914 cannot be said to have actually assumed the initiative of agitating for war. The Comintern of 1938 did. The masses drifted, in the clutch of the diplomacy of their governments. As an organized international force and as a political factor, the working class were therefore absent. The Britsh Labor party on account of its pro-war stand is committed to the heavier rearmament program of Chamberlain. Their leaders like Lord Strabolgi have already come out "for a measure of compulsory National Service" that is to say, conscription.

In sharp contrast with the chauvinist incitements of the Laborite and Stalinist organizations was the fervent peace sentiment manifested by the masses. More than ever that peace sentiment becomes a progressive factor that intelligent revolutionary socialist policy must reckon with. The "struggle for peace" which the Moscow Comintern proclaimed as its guiding light at its Seventh Congress, and which ostensibly justified the Franco-Soviet pact and U.S.S.R. entry into the League of Nations, turned in reality into a struggle for imperialist war. The American League for Peace and Democracy (erstwhile League Against War and Fascism) became the leading exponents of "collective security" for the imperialist status quo. The crisis made clear that the "pacifism" of the masses, repeatedly evidenced in the United States by the figures of the Gallup poll and the support of the Ludlow Amendment, is well nigh universal. Even in France when the workers were brought face to face with the impending catastrophe of war, Stalinist propaganda rapidly lost influence. The struggle for peace must become one of the cornerstones of our policy. But we must convince the masses that the way to peace lies as little in "isolation" as in "collective security" and certainly does not lie in huge programs of rearmament. We must prove that the struggle for peace can be victorious only as a struggle for socialism, that it can be secured not by congressional resolutions or constitutional amendments, but by the working class conquest of power.

Maurice SPECTOR

August 1943

# Fourth International

*To the Memory of Leon Trotsky*
*November 7, 1879--August 21, 1940*

## Italy: The First Phase of the Revolution

## The Court Verdict on the Assassin of Leon Trotsky

*By Walter O'Rourke*

## Campaign for a Labor Party *by James P. Cannon*


The CIO Program . . . . . *by Felix Morrow*
The Roosevelt Regime in Crisis . *by William Warde*
A Report on the Comintern . . *by Leon Trotsky*
A Manual of Party Organization . *by E. R. Frank*

INTERNATIONAL NOTES: England, Mexico, Cuba


Twenty Cents

## Canadian Labor's Election Victories

### AN EXAMPLE FOR U. S. TRADE UNIONS TO FOLLOW

**Every supporter of an Independent Labor Party based on the trade unions should acquaint himself with the inspiring facts of the labor victories in the recent elections in Canada. These facts should be told in every union hall; they show the trend of the workers and dirt farmers of this continent away from the capitalist parties; they are an annihilating answer to the pretense of the CIO and AFL leadership that the workers are not yet ready for independent political action.**

The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, based on trade unions, farmers' groups and constituency clubs—a Farmer-Labor Party—was founded ten years ago, a product of the economic crisis. Until recently it had strength primarily in British Columbia and the far western districts of Canada—the traditional stronghold of radicalism in the Dominion. During the last years it emerged as the second party in British Columbia, polling 150,000 votes out of a total population of about three-quarters of a million. On a national scale it showed comparatively little strength in the 1940 elections, winning eight out of the 245 seats in the House of Commons.

But in the three years since then, the workers and dirt farmers have been moving away from the capitalist parties. The first opportunity to record the extent of this development came in the August 4 elections to the legislature of Ontario province of eastern Canada. This province contains one-third of the Dominion's population and more than half the country's industries; previously the CCF had no seats in the Ontario legislature.

The CCF emerged from the election with 34 out of the 90 seats; two other seats were won by Communist Party candidates (under "Labor-Progressive" labels—the Communist Party was still illegal). The CCF won all its seats away from the two capitalist parties—29 from the Liberals (representing the present Dominion government) and five from the Progressive Conservatives, the opposition capitalist party which came out first with 38 seats, leaving the present administration with a drop from 63 to 14. No party won a majority, so a coalition must govern Ontario; but the CCF has promised that it will not collaborate with the capitalist parties.

Every industrial seat in Ontario (its capital, Toronto, is Canada's second city) went to CCF candidates (and the two CP candidates). Many of the 34 elected are trade unionists, mainly of CIO unions.

Of equal significance with the Ontario election were four by-elections on August 9 for the Dominion House of Commons; they showed the same trend. All the seats had been held by the Liberal Party which now rules Canada. The two western farm seats were won by CCF candidates. Of the two in the French-Canadian province of Quebec, one was won by the Communist Party (in Montreal, Canada's principal city), and the other by the newly-formed Bloc Populaire, an anti-war but reactionary French-Canadian party.

### THEY VOTED AGAINST THE CAPITALIST CLASS

The main trend is indisputably clear: the hitherto dominant Liberal Party is being emptied, the workers and dirt farmers going to the left, while a section of the middle class is going to the right. Under the impact of the war and its economic consequences, class lines are being drawn sharply. In addition to its victories in labor constituencies, the CCF showed notable strength among young people and lower-income-bracket elements of the urban middle class—a clear indication that these elements are looking to labor for leadership.

The Stalinists supported the CCF only because the whole labor movement was doing so, and are trying to drag the CCF into "national unity" with the Liberal government. Fearful of the effect of the CCF example on U. S. trade unionists, the Stalinists are attempting to minimize the class significance of the CCF gains. Thus a dispatch to the August 15 *Worker* says the elections showed "a lack of confidence not so much on the basis of the Government's war record—Canada's achievements

in the war effort have been considerable—as its domestic policies." In reality, however, the government's conduct constitutes an inseparable whole against which the workers and farmers voted. In Canada as in the U. S., the government's foreign and domestic policies are inextricably bound together.

That does not mean that the CCF has opposed the war or that the workers now brand it as an imperialist war. The CCF has supported the war, but with reserves and criticisms; it has protested the inevitably anti-labor methods of conducting the war. Its left wing (called "Trotskyist" by the Stalinists) claims to advocate a socialist solution to war and fascism, and has considerable strength. The CCF leadership has also increasingly emphasized the demand for "public ownership of natural resources and industries." During the 1942 vote on conscription, the CCF advocated the "conscription of wealth" as well as men; just what that meant its advocates never made clear, but it appealed to the masses as anti-capitalist. In the Ontario election the CCF leader, E. B. Jolliffe, vaguely posed the issue as reaction or socialism: "Every democratic country is moving toward more collectivist organization. . . . Shall it be collectivism of the authoritarian brand, or democratic collectivism?" We need scarcely enlarge on our estimate of the reformist weakness of the CCF program. What is all-important, however, is that the votes of the masses indicated their resistance to the effects of the war and their desire for a break with capitalism and its parties.

Nor do the votes for the rabidly pro-war Stalinists indicate otherwise. They won their prestige among the workers in their "anti-war" period preceding Hitler's attack on the USSR, a period in which they led strikes and demonstrations which the masses have not forgotten. Jailed during that period, Stalinist leaders were not released, in many cases, until long after they turned pro-war. To this day the government has not rescinded its outlawry of the Communist Party. The workers look upon it as the representative of the Soviet Union. These factors, and not its chauvinism, explain the Communist Party votes.

## THE WORKERS DISTRUST THE CAPITALIST FUTURE

The relatively small working class of agrarian Canada has shown the way to the giant proletariat of the industrial U. S. This example on the northern part of our continent must be shoved into the faces of the CIO and AFL leadership until they can no longer pretend not to have seen it. The U. S. workers have no faith in the capitalist future; their next great step on the road to socialism will be to break away as a class from the capitalist parties.

Even the trade union bureaucrats admit in their own queasy way that the working class has no faith in the future of capitalism. Thus AFL president William Green on August 17 declares: "We have made up our minds that organized workers of all nations, and particularly the AFL, shall be fully represented at the peace conference to prevent any such debacle [as territorial grabbing]." Green here reflects the workers' distrust of a capitalist peace; but he and his bureaucratic caste propose no way whereby the workers may be "fully represented." That could be done only by a Workers' Government, while the Greens are resisting to the bitter end all steps toward formation of Labor's own party. The fantastic gap between Green's grandiloquent aim—nothing less than a labor-guided peace—and his servile capitalist-party politics is not accidental: it demonstrates the increasing gap between the workers' needs and the inadequate machinery of simon-pure trade unionism. The gap can and must be filled by an Independent Labor Party. The day of its achievement can be speeded by broadcasting far and wide in the trade unions the example of the Canadian workers.

HARBINGERS OF THE APPROACHING STORM

Throughout Europe the rumblings of the coming revolutionary storm can be heard—above all in France, where the clouds of civil war have long been gathering. Little is needed now to explode the rotted structure of bourgeois rule. Foremost among the worries of the "democracies" is the fear, amounting almost to certainty, that their invasion of the Continent will touch off an explosion in France and elsewhere and that they may be unable to quench the resulting revolutionary conflagration.

Nor are things going so well for the ruling class within the "democracies" themselves. In Britain last month more than 100,000 coal miners went out on strike and succeeded in winning concessions from their employers. The fact that they tied up a large section of a vital industry in determined disregard of government warnings that such a strike might have disastrous effects on maturing plans for the invasion of Europe, is of the highest significance. It means that at least a very large section of the British working class is no longer subject to the hypnosis of war propaganda and is prepared resolutely to fight for labor's rights in the very course of the war. The misleaders of British labor, the hardened and cynical labor lieutenants of the capitalist class, remain united in coalition with the Tories, but the rank-and-file of the workers are breaking away and taking to the road of independent struggle.

The same phenomenon is to be observed in Australia, where thousands of coal miners struck in defiance of the conservative union leaders and the government. Even when the government attempted grand intimidation by drafting some 500 miners into the armed forces, the strikers held firm until they had gained most of their demands.

DEVELOPMENTS IN CANADA AND USA

In Canada, large masses of workers and farmers who previously have followed the capitalist political parties are streaming into the Canadian Commonwealth Federation at a remarkable rate. The CCF is led by a reformist, wishy-washy, middle-of-the-road coterie not one whit more advanced than the conservative leadership of the British and Australian labor parties. But the mass movement in its direction is nonetheless very significant. It means that the Canadian masses are breaking definitively with the avowed capitalist parties and embarking on the road of independent working class political action. The extent of the movement may be gauged by the fact that as early as last August, in the Ontario elections, the CCF secured 34 of the 85 seats in the provincial legislature. It was the first time in the history of eastern Canada that the workers turned so sharply against the capitalist parties. At the same time, the Canadian Congress of Labor (CIO) has increased its membership from 55,000 in 1940 to more than 250,000 at the present time.

In this country the launching of a labor party in Michigan, heart of the industrial Midwest, under the auspices of CIO unions representing 225,000 workers, holds the promise for the commencement of a general breakaway by American labor from capitalist politics.

STRIKES, HUNGER RIOTS IN JAPAN

Even in imperialist Japan the monolithic war structure is beginning at last to crack. Reports by Japanese prisoners of war in Chungking tell of strikes by workers and hunger riots by peasants in the very shadow of the imperial palace in Tokyo. The strike movement got under way even before the extension of the war to the

## Canadian Anti-War Struggles

The process of mass radicalization as the direct consequence of the second world war is by no means limited to war-torn Europe. Significant signs of it have been for some time now discernible in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in Canada. One of its elementary expressions is the growth of unionization. The labor movement in Canada has grown apace.

The Canadian CIO numbers in its ranks more than a quarter of a million, a membership exceeding that of the Canadian Trades and Labor Congress (AFL) in 1920 and representing almost a fivefold increase in the last five years for the CIO unions. The AFL has likewise registered a proportionate growth. Canada has never known an organized labor movement of such scope and power.

The growth of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) expresses this mass radicalization in the political field. In unprecedented numbers, Canadian workers have recorded their complete break with the native capitalist parties. Especially significant is the fact that the soldier vote for the CCF candidates in wartime elections represents a higher percentage than in the civilian vote.

These developments almost automatically pose the question of what the developments in the United States would be, with its far more powerful labor movement, if the workers here were given the same opportunity as in Canada to vote for a party of their own in direct opposition to the candidates of the Democratic and Republican parties.

The opposition of the Canadian masses to the war is hardly a secret. From the outset this opposition acted to restrain the authorities from sending conscript troops abroad. With the growing war weariness the opposition has tended to assume increasingly sharper forms. The number of Canadian soldiers AWOL is admittedly large, the latest estimate being more than 6,000. The soldiers have other ways of demonstrating their feelings. According to Canada's Tory leader John Bracken it is the custom of drafted men to throw their arms and equipment overboard upon sailing.

Recent dispatches from Canada tell of sharp clashes between the populace and military authorities in search of draft evaders. Canadian students and youth in general are evincing less and less enthusiasm to shed their blood for the glory and profit of Canadian capitalism and the British empire.

### OPPOSITION IN CANADA

During the first world war militant opposition likewise manifested itself. But it was primarily restricted to the French Canadian population with a long tradition of revolt against British rule. This was the main source of opposition in the initial period of the second world war. The striking fact is that such is no longer the case. Oppositional elements are today strong among the English Canadians as well. As a matter of fact, the bitterest conflicts over the draft have occurred precisely among the latter.

Conditions of ripening social crisis invariably act to polarize the population. The camps that grow are those on the left and on the right. The intermediate formations tend to disappear. In Canada the first stage of this polarization is clearly observable. The ground is slipping beneath the Mackenzie King government which seeks to straddle or compromise issues. It is caught between the leftward moving masses and the capitalist die-hards.

The Canadian Tories, alarmed at the growing class consciousness of the masses are seeking a showdown. They have administered a cruel blow to the regime by defeating in a recent by-election General McNaughton, who is the Defense Minister. Fearing defeat in the national elections, Prime Minister King has prorogued the Canadian parliament for a month, in the hope that the hostilities in Europe may terminate by that time.

But this will halt neither the leftward swing of the masses, nor the determination of Canadian reactionaries to check it by the use of the sharpest measures at their command.

The program of the CCF is far from revolutionary. It is the "respectable" program of reforms and does not transcend the framework of capitalism. But the pressure of the unfolding conflict is bearing down with full fury on this movement. How far the CCF will go depends not on the wishes of the present cowardly leadership but on the degree of self-action achieved by the masses. The more confident and demanding the latter become the more surely and easily will they move on the road to socialist solutions.

The coming elections, which cannot be indefinitely postponed, will provide a significant measure of the crisis. The events in Canada are of especial importance because they will be mirrored on the morrow and on a much vaster scale across the border where similar processes are taking place at a slower tempo.

## The World Trade Union Conference

Coincident with the latest secret conclave of the "Big Three" in Crimea, a World Trade Union Conference on February convened in London. The initiative for this conference came from the British union chieftains. In addition to the latter, the main delegations came from the camp of the so-called "United Nations." Among those present were the Russian (Stalinized) trade unions, the CIO, the British dominions (including India), Latin America (Mexico, Cuba, Columbia, Uruguay) and a scattering of neutral countries (among them Spain, Sweden and Ireland). China, where the labor movement has been crushed for years, was represented by two handpicked flunkeys of Chiang Kai-shek. The AFL refused to participate.

The assembled body boasted of speaking in the name of 50 to 60 million organized workers. This is indeed a mighty force. In point of numbers, no such labor gathering had ever been assembled before in wartime. But the London conference did not serve the interests of labor. Instead it wrote another page of infamy into the annals of the betrayal of the world working class. Individually and collectively the delegates ranged themselves on the side of the "democratic" imperialists. Their primary task was to dragoon the workers behind the infamous "peace" plans of the three grave diggers of civilization at Yalta. The conference not only telegraphed to Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin its "satisfaction with the results of the Crimea Conference," but incorporated this "unanimous endorsement" in a Manifesto.

Servility vied with treachery. These creatures begged Churchill to address them. This is the same Churchill who is fighting to enforce in England the strikebreaking legislation—the Trade Disputes Act—passed in 1927 after the defeat of the General Strike. This is the same Churchill whose hands still drip with the fresh blood of slaughtered men, women and children in Greece.

These flunkeys underwrote in advance the plan for the dismemberment and looting of Germany. They even approved slave labor for the German toilers, doing so under a weasel formula: "if" despite their "protests" slave labor is instituted, then it "must be placed under international supervision with trade union participation."

They don't even ask for direct participation in "all phases"

# Foreign Press Clippi

## Canada

A new Marxist paper published in Canada, *Labour Challenge*, has just been received by us. In the July number (Vol. 1, No. 2), the editors review the lessons of the recent elections in Canada. They state in part:

"It can afford us no great pleasure to say that our criticisms of some aspects of the CCF program and policy were proven correct by the election results. For we can only understand the elections as a defeat, although of a temporary character, for Canadian labor. The 180% increase to 28 seats in parliament won by the CCF is no cause for complacency or rejoicing. Eighteen of these seats are from Saskatchewan and of the remainder, 9 from other western provinces with one from the mining district of Nova Scotia. None are from the industrial and population centre of Canada, Ontario and Quebec, which is a grave weakness and danger signal.

. . . We must use the word defeat in describing the election results for in many cases, including Saskatchewan and Quebec, the CCF received less votes than in the preceding provincial elections of last year! There are those who would explain this defeat simply on the strength of the propaganda campaign of the Gladstone Murrays and Trestrails backed up by the war-swollen profits of the capitalist class. We must answer them with the simple truth that the reactionary and decadent ruling class will fight much harder and with more powerful weapons before it succumbs to the forces of social progress. But we must admit that the pamphlets "Social Suicide" and the condensed version of the "Road to Serfdom" [Hayek's book, reviewed in the June 1945 F.I.] had some effect in confusing many middle class elements and some workers. The fact that isn't mentioned is that the CCF leaders did little or nothing to educate their members and even many of their candidates in the socialist answers to this elementary capitalist propaganda.

The mistake of underestimating the reactionary role of the [Stalinist] Labor-Progressive Party over a period of years permitted them to play a damaging role of no small consequence, particularly in the Ontario election which had a profound psychological effect on the Federal election. . . . The LPP's consistent pounding on the false line, that the Tories are the main danger and that we must unite with the Liberals to defeat them, bore fruit. It influenced many workers to vote Liberal and a small handful to vote LPP. The political action committee of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, AFL central body, endorsed King at the last moment. This stab in the back by the craft union bureaucrats is directly attributable to the Labor-Progressive Party which holds the balance of power in the non-political T. & L.C. of C. . . .

In part we attribute the defeats of June 4 and 11, for the CCF and labor, to the capitalist propaganda campaign, the gigantic sums spent by the old parties, who were aided by the LPP. But the main reason for the defeat and the point we must emphasize if we are going to learn from mistakes, was the passive, wishy-washy campaign conducted by the CCF in most constituencies. The organizational policy of the CCF in maintaining only an electioneering party proved false and meant that when the election rolled around in many constituencies there was a real scarcity of election workers. . . .

While the organizational question was a factor in the defeat the most important question is political. The election was fought by the CCF on an abstract program of nationalization of the monopoly industries and other general reforms. No real distinction was made between nationalization under bureaucratic capitalist control like the C.N.R. [Canadian National Railway], etc., and nationalization under a socialist government with workers' control. The immediate problems of the workers such as lay-offs were not adequately handled. The promises of the CCF in many cases actually appeared to be smaller than the promises of the Liberals and Tories. The policy of tail-ending the Liberals on the conscription and other war issues, including the important issue of peace, pursued by the national leadership, further tended to blur the real issues in the election. The cautious, negative, abstract campaign played into the hands of our opponents and forced the CCF supporters on the defensive. A militant, positive, concrete, socialist campaign would have gained votes from all sections of the exploited masses and forced our opponents on the defensive. . . ."

## The POUM Congress

The Congress recently held by the POUM, the tone and the content of the resolutions approved, represent the lamentable finish of that Party, as well as the conclusion of a centrist party's experience. That is to say, of a party which wanted to combine revolutionary language with opportunist policy and practice. After this Congress, the POUM will not even be that. The POUM has been converted into a Catalonian party, after having thrown overboard the Marxism which it claimed to have come to defend.

In the theses approved in this Congress—theses which were distributed to those present only in the Catalonian language—it is decided to liquidate the peninsular (all-Spain) organization of the POUM and limit the action of the party to Catalonia, and orientate toward the building of a type of Catalonian labor party.

Responding to a question from Señor Irla, President of the Catalonian Parliament, the POUM has advised the setting-up of a National Council of Catalonia, based upon a political Catalonian Bloc of all parties. This organization should take the power in Catalonia after the fall of Franco.

The fundamental task of this organization is to prepare in advance the repressive police forces "in order to avoid," says the POUM, "uncontrolled excesses and unthinking actions at the